

Approved For Release 2000/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06365A000200060015-9

Ambassador Gaganvihari Mehta, India, Ambassador to the United States, in May 1954.

Ambassador Eikichi Araki, Japan, Ambassador to the United States, in December 1953.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Qudrat-I-Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Adm. Renato de Almeida Gullobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, Netherlands, in April 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor, of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enrico Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeill, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

Abdel Meguid Pasha Saleh, Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

Prince Seif Al-Islam, Abdullah Hamiduddin, of Yemen, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

Tribute to Dr. Gabriel Hauge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, July 21. It very appropriately commends an able public official of the Eisenhower administration, who, after 6 years of devoted service, is now returning to private life. I have a very high regard for Dr. Gabriel Hauge. His counsel and guidance through a difficult period in our country's history have been of tremendous value to the American people.

I wish to join with his many friends in offering my congratulations and best wishes to Dr. Hauge.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1958]

DR. HAUGE'S SERVICE

This has not been the easiest imaginable period in which to serve as a Presidential special assistant for economic affairs. For one thing, it has become almost axiomatic in the public mind that the Government should, or at least can, manage the national

economy in a way to assure a constant and lovely prosperity. When it became evident last year that the business turnaround was going to be of more than a few months duration and probably more severe than most recent recessions the pressure inevitably grew for the Government to do something. Just as inevitably, from some quarters there was pressure to do nothing.

Dr. Gabriel Hauge was in the spot where his counsel to President Eisenhower was a major element in administration policymaking. In simplest terms, the policy was a middle of the road one—holding the line on taxes, refraining from gigantic public works, but accelerating the flow of expenditures which already were planned over a longer period. Dr. Hauge himself, attributing the course to the President's own judgment, referred to it as "sensible economics, not razzle-dazzle substitutes." In answer, Mr. Eisenhower called it "your own economic philosophy."

There is evidence, in any case, that the economy has turned back uphill and that the policies followed are entitled to some of the credit. In this circumstance, it seems fair to transfer a share of this credit to Dr. Hauge and to wish him well in the private banking career he has decided to undertake.

National Defense Education Bill To Come Before the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman CARL ELLIOTT and members of the House Subcommittee on Special Education for drafting the national-defense education bill which will soon come before the House for consideration.

This is the first time that legislation to provide scholarships and loans for well-qualified but needy students has been reported out of committee in the House, although some of us have been pressing for such a bill for a long time. Shortly after taking my seat as a Member of the House in the 83d Congress, I filed a bill which would establish a Federal scholarship loan program. I filed the bill again in the 84th Congress and in the 85th Congress, the latest bill number being H. R. 95. I am very pleased to know that the House Education Committee has incorporated my scholarship loan feature into the National Defense Education bill.

Mr. Speaker, since I filed H. R. 95 in January 1957, the need for a broader Federal scholarship program has been sharply brought into focus by the scientific advances made by the Soviets with the launching of their first earth satellite. As I told the members of the Education Subcommittee in January, the problem of financing higher education for the vast number of exceptionally bright American high-school graduates transcends all of the other problems with which this Nation is faced because of the cold war.

I think that these young people should be given the opportunity to develop their intellectual potential, not only for their own benefit, but for the benefit of their growing country and the free world. If the United States is going to remain ahead of the Soviets in the present race for survival, it cannot afford to lose its vast reservoir of brainpower in the fields of engineering, science, and the humanities merely because these young Americans cannot pay for a college education.

To meet this emergency, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Federal Government has now got to establish some direct Federal scholarships and student loans for young Americans who have achieved brilliant records in private, parochial, and public high schools. However, as a permanent program, I am still in favor of a Federal scholarship revolving fund from which loans can be made to students sincerely desiring a college education in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the national defense education bill and will vote for it when it comes to the floor of the House. I certainly hope that the Rules Committee will grant a hearing on this legislation soon and clear the measure for House action.

The Crisis in the Middle East and Our Declining Influence in International Relations

25X1X8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE A. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a newsletter commenting on this Nation's declining influence in international relations. The newsletter follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND OUR DECLINING INFLUENCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The action of the President in sending American troops to Lebanon in the Near East is an action fraught with grave dangers and consequences. But the failure to act would have indicated weakness on our part and the President's decisiveness and forthrightness has undoubtedly won the support of a majority of our citizens.

Our Nation is committed both legally and morally to help our friends and allies maintain their independence and resist Communist aggression. The murder of the leaders and citizens of Iraq and the coup to take over the Government of that country were merely the latest and most extreme of a whole series of Communist-inspired moves to take over the Arab nations 1 by 1. To fail to prevent this movement from spreading would be to surrender and to yield to Communist aggression.

American troops were sent to Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government and following our country's promise to provide such assistance when needed and requested.

Approved For Release 2000/08/31 : CIA-RDP78-06365A000200060015-9

world. Their exploits, with limited and ramshackle equipment, and the later exploits of his Regular Army command in China, make a separate chapter in the history of air warfare and made a world figure of General Chennault.

Twenty-one years ago the then Captain Chennault retired from the United States Army Air Corps. He had been grounded for months because of illness, partly due to overwork and partly due to frustration in a persistent effort to win support for his theories of aerial warfare. The day after his retirement he was on his way to China to do what he could with the only thing he had left, the ability to fly and to teach others to fly.

HIS PLANES ROPED TOGETHER

For almost two decades he had made no progress at all in his attempts to substitute formation tactics for fighter planes for the dogfight style of World War I. He had been a part of the successful but uphill campaign by the airmen to get recognition from the high commands of the Army and Navy.

In 1934 he had seen his future in the Army blasted when his name was removed from the list of candidates for Command and General Staff School. In 1936 his persistent fight within his own branch was lost when the Air Corps Tactical School stopped teaching fighter tactics. Bombers were going to win the next war in the air, and they needed no fighter escorts. Nor could fighter planes keep bombers from hitting their targets.

His Three Men on a Flying Trapeze, himself and two other pilots who flew intricate maneuvers, diving and looping, with their planes roped together, was intended to demonstrate the possibilities of formation flying. It was used only as an Air Corps sideshow, to enliven public interest. Captain Chennault also had experimented briefly with dropping troops by parachute, only to be told, "Stop that nonsense."

Friends who had quit the service and gone to China, including his two flying trapeze partners, had written optimistically of the possibilities there, especially with Mme. Chiang Kai-shek taking over the reform of the nation's air arm. China seemed to be his only hope.

His first assignment was a survey of the Chinese airpower. It was supposed to have 500 planes. It had 91 fit for combat. No one knew how many pilots there were who really could fly. Before Chennault could even get started on a reorganization, Japan attacked, and he spent the next 4 years trying to keep enough planes in the air to stave off the Japanese.

Late in 1940, Chennault was sent back to the United States by Chiang Kai-shek in a desperate search for help. He managed to get hold of 100 P-40's and effected an arrangement whereby Army and Navy pilots could leave the service to fight for China. The first contingent of the American volunteer group, soon to become the famed Flying Tigers, left for the Orient in July 1941.

By the time the Flying Tigers were inducted into the United States Army Air Force in April 1942 they had achieved a formidable reputation, particularly in the fighting over Rangoon. There, with barely a score of P-40's, oftentimes fewer than that, they destroyed 217 enemy planes in 31 encounters.

Chennault was given command of the new Chinese air task force with the rank of brigadier general. In the 9 months of its existence the CATF destroyed 149 enemy planes in the air, broke up more than three score enemy bombing missions and dropped 314 tons of bombs.

In March 1943, the CATF was absorbed into the 14th Air Force with Chennault commanding as major general. In its 3 years, the 14th destroyed 2,600 enemy planes plus 1,500 probables; sank or damaged 2,230,000 tons of enemy shipping, 44 naval vessels, 13,000 river

boats and 573 bridges, and killed 60,700 enemy troops.

General Chennault retired after 8 continuous years of fighting the Japanese. The Chinese Government at the time felt they were losing their best American friend.

The General was born at Commerce, Tex., and raised by his father to be a cotton planter. But he struck out on his own early, worked his way through Louisiana State University and later through Louisiana State Teachers College and taught for a while before enlisting in the Army in World War I. In 1920, he transferred to the Army Air Corps.

HAD HEADQUARTERS ON FORMOSA

After his second retirement in 1945 he decided not to return to America. Instead, he founded the Civil Air Transport, a commercial line at first designed to serve trade into and out of China. With General Chennault at the helm, it had difficulty remaining strictly civilian.

As the Communists took over China, the CAT moved gradually to its present headquarters on Formosa. At the time of the Indochina war, 26 of its American civilian pilots formed the airlift that helped sustain Dienbienphu until it capitulated.

General Chennault was married in 1911 to the former Nell Thompson. They had 6 sons and 2 daughters. They were divorced in 1946. The next year General Chennault married a Chinese girl, Anna Chan. He was 57 years old at the time and she was 24. They had 2 daughters.

The lung cancer which caused his death was first detected during a routine examination in 1955. The General kept it a secret until failing health led him to make an announcement of it shortly before Christmas in 1957.

Survivors include General Chennault's second wife and their 2 daughters, Anna Claire, 10, and Cynthia Louise, 8.

Other survivors include the 8 children by his first wife, Mrs. Nell Thomas Chennault, of Waterproof, La.; Col. John S. Chennault, air attaché at the United States Embassy, Madrid, Spain; Max T. Chennault, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Robert Lee, Los Angeles; M. Sgt. Charles Chennault, Mobile, Ala.; Maj. Claire Patrick Chennault, United States Air Force, Eglin Field, Fla.; David Chennault, Monroe, La.; Robert Chennault, Waterproof, and Mrs. Rosemary Marten, Natchez, Miss.

Also, 3 brothers, Joe Chennault, Alexandria, Va.; William S. Chennault, Sweetwater, Tex., and Ernest N. Chennault, San Antonio, Tex.

THE EDUCATION BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has given impetus to a vital program designed to stimulate our education system and meet the challenges of today's rapidly changing technology and to meet the scientific and educational needs of our Nation. The President has asked for a "shot in the arm" for American education. The administration proposals give support to our educational system for which additional support is urgently needed for our Nation's security. It in no way interferes with the traditional concepts of local control over our educational system and facilities. The pending legislation is designed only to supplement and aid, in the national interest, our national educational objectives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, following these remarks, a statement by Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

In the next few weeks Congress will have the best opportunity in many years to take new action of far-reaching benefit to American education.

The opportunity is provided in the bill voted out by a 23 to 2 bipartisan majority of the House Committee on Education and Labor and now awaiting action by the House of Representatives.

This bill is the product of long and earnest consideration of a wide variety of proposals to help our educational system respond to the challenge of our times. The committee has performed a splendid service in developing an admirable bill in a field that is complex and difficult—and crucially important.

The basic purpose of the bill is to help our schools and colleges meet certain emergency needs which are particularly important to national security and the national interest. In the light of world conditions today, the need for action is greater than ever.

The bill would help improve and broaden the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It would provide Federal scholarships based on student ability and financial need, and in addition would establish student loan funds to be financed by Federal funds and colleges. The bill would help reduce the waste of young talent, through improved testing and counseling in elementary and secondary schools. And it would help train more college teachers.

The bill holds exciting prospects for improvement in American education. It provides support in fields where additional support is urgently needed. And it will serve, both directly and indirectly, as a stimulus to greater State, local, and private effort for better education.

The President has urged that action on behalf of education be given a top priority in the remaining weeks of Congress. As he had indicated, the administration hopes the pending bill can be even further improved as it progresses through Congress.

I believe this bill represents the best hope, almost the only hope, for effective new action at this session of Congress to advance American education.

I believe a sound bill can and will be passed if all of those who really want to improve education will unite in vigorous support of action on this bill now.

Enactment of the bill would demonstrate an awakening national recognition of the critical importance of education to the future of the country. Failure to act now could be viewed as indifference to the role of education in these grave times. I believe the American people will be deeply disappointed if Congress neglects the national interest in education at this critical point.

In education, the hour is late. We must begin to act before it is too late.

LAUNCHING OF ANOTHER EARTH SATELLITE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, all of us were delighted a few days ago when another earth satellite was successfully launched into orbit. The vehicle used was the Jupiter "C." This is the third satellite which that vehicle has placed in orbit around the earth.

Mr. President, I think something of perhaps even greater significance than the recent firing of the Jupiter was the

nations be conducted within that international organization, originated for the purpose.

Meanwhile, let us pray divine guidance for the President in this historical hour while we remain united behind him.

Training
**Graduate Education Expansion Programs
 in the Proposed National Education
 Defense Act of 1958**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 25, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of national security, especially during these tense times of international turmoil, the provision in the proposed National Defense Education Act for the expansion of the Nation's graduate education programs is of unprecedented significance to the American educational system. The urgency of our need dictates that we provide more adequately for the staffing of our institutions of higher education.

This need for assistance to graduate education programs existed long before the stark realization of sputnik's challenge and the resultant widespread recognition of America's educational shortcomings. In fact, many of these educational deficiencies had already been analyzed by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School and presented in their second report to the President last July. I was especially impressed by the foresight of the Committee members when, in their consideration of graduate education, they affirmed that—

At the present more than 225,000 full-time and part-time instructional staff members serve in 1,900 colleges and universities, of which over 1,300 grant at least one kind of degree.

A number of variables, including the speed with which enrollments rise, student-teacher ratios and the rate of faculty turnover, will affect the total needs for college teachers in the next several years. Taking conservative estimates with respect to these variables, somewhere between 180,000 and 270,000 new college teachers must be recruited in a dozen years—between 15,000 and 22,500 annually. Less conservative assumptions would indicate a considerably higher need.

The graduate schools, source of the most advanced education for college teachers, are currently awarding about 9,000 doctoral degrees annually. Into teaching go probably no more than 5,000 of these candidates, a considerable proportion of whom are already engaged in teaching before receiving their doctorates. The cumulative deficit at the doctoral level is an alarming prospect.

About half of the new college teachers now come from other sources than graduate schools. One source is high-school faculties. But since the quality of college education is heavily dependent upon strong secondary schools, this is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Further aggravating the problem is the aging of the population of college teachers, more than 35 percent of whom are already 45 or over, and the relatively small pool from

which to recruit. The 24- to 45-age group in our population is already relatively small, and in the next decade, just when the student population is reaching new heights, faculty reduction by death and retirement appears likely to accelerate at a time when the student population is increasing from the present 3 million to an estimated 6 million.

The President's Committee further reported:

Important areas of knowledge such as the fields of classical learning, history, literature, philosophy, the social studies and theoretical science have their principal, if not unique, sponsorship in the universities and colleges. Salaries in these fields are not so affected by outside demand as in the professional and technological fields.

Yet we dare not concentrate on certain fields of serious present shortage in the competitive market, to the exclusion of other fields, for we must look forward to long-range progress in all fields of knowledge. Indeed, in a society with increasing technological bias it becomes increasingly important that high talent be attracted into research and teaching in the social studies, the humanities, and pure science.

More evidence of the need to assist in programs for graduate expansion to provide for the staffing of the Nation's colleges and universities was presented during the recent house hearings on scholarship and loan programs when Dr. Lawrence Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, testified that:

Attention has been called repeatedly to the critical shortage of first-rate teachers in this country today. The need is great at all levels of education, and it is becoming increasingly pressing in the institutions of higher education. The colleges and universities will soon be flooded with students far beyond their present numbers, and they will therefore require greatly increased numbers of teachers.

It will take more of an effort to find and train these teachers than is generally realized because today the graduate schools of our universities award annually somewhat less than 9,000 doctoral degrees. This degree represents the desired and standard preparation for teaching in college. It is to be hoped that in the years ahead more students will receive it, but present trends are not reassuring. The output has been almost at a standstill for a number of years.

Here I want to say a word about the qualifications of new full-time college teachers. Recent studies indicate a deterioration in these qualifications. For example, in 1953-54, 40 percent of all college teachers held doctoral degrees, but in this same year only 31 percent of the new college teachers had such degrees. Three years later the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent, which represents a serious loss indeed.

In the same statement, Dr. Derthick emphasized the need to improve college-level teaching in certain essential fields. Dr. Derthick said:

The quality of new full-time college teachers is uneven as between the different subject-matter fields. The deterioration is felt more severely in fields with which the Nation is now much concerned—physical science, mathematics, and engineering. In these the percentages of new full-time college teachers with the doctorate declined in 3 years by 18 percent, 40 percent, and 30 percent, respectively.

Many of the graduate schools have few students because the schools do not have the resources to instruct larger numbers.

Graduate education is costly. It requires expensive and costly library and laboratory facilities. Graduate education of students is largely on an individual basis, which means that the ratio of teachers to students is necessarily high. Moreover, many graduate students have families for whom living accommodations must be made available. This heavy cost limits the number of universities that can offer acceptable opportunities for graduate study.

Consequently, today there are only some 165 institutions out of a national total of 1,850 that confer doctoral degrees based on graduate instruction. Sixty-nine of these are under public control and 94 are under private control. In the year 1955-56, 60 institutions each conferred fewer than 10 doctoral degrees, and 108 conferred 10 or more. Only a few—37 to be exact—awarded more than 100 such degrees. It appears, therefore, that a considerable potential exists for increasing the output of our graduate schools.

The extreme importance of the role of the Federal Government in aiding the expansion of graduate education through a program of fellowships was supported by the testimony of Dr. Philip Coombs, director of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, when he stated before the subcommittee:

I believe the Federal Government can do more than it is now doing to assist in this direction without in any sense taking over control of education.

First, higher education in the United States today is seriously threatened by an erosion of quality. This erosion is already taking place, due in no small measure to inadequate economic resources and to the inefficient use of those resources. The decline of educational quality, which we can ill afford at this point in history, can only be averted if our colleges and universities are better financed, if they succeed in getting a larger share of the Nation's finest manpower for teaching, and if they make the most efficient use of that manpower and other resources.

It seems to me that there are two factors here. The first and most basic is that our economy, our society as a whole, is up against an overall shortage of high ability manpower, not only in science and engineering, but in other fields as well. This not because we have a smaller supply than we used to have but, rather, because the dynamic growth of our economy has created a much greater demand than ever.

The second factor is that teaching is at an increasing competitive disadvantage in bidding for its share of this limited supply of well-educated manpower. We have allowed economic rewards for teaching to deteriorate in relation to the rewards for other occupations. We have allowed the prestige of teaching, apart from the economic rewards, to deteriorate relative to other fields demanding the same quality of manpower.

To correct the situation, it seems to me, we must move in two directions. First, we must do everything we can to expand the overall supply of highly trained manpower. This we can only do through strengthening education, and it is a slow process. We cannot perform miracles in a year or two, but we must start promptly toward this long-run goal.

Secondly, we must put teaching in a stronger competitive position, partly by raising salaries substantially, but also by utilizing good teachers as effectively as we can, thereby making the supply go further. We must make teaching much more attractive, not merely in financial rewards but in the challenge of the work itself, so that our ablest young people will enter the field in large numbers.

The urgent need for a program of graduate fellowships was also stressed by Dr. Charles C. Cole, Jr., of Columbia University who urged on behalf of the Association for Higher Education that:

Congress . . . provide Federal funds for the support of a program of fellowships for 5,000 graduate students the first year of its operation.

We also urge that students granted scholarships and fellowships under any new Federal program that may be enacted be left completely free to choose their own subject-matter fields of study and occupational objectives in the recognized institutions they choose to attend, without any limitations imposed by their acceptance of such scholarships or fellowships.

The value of Federal assistance for the expansion of graduate education programs was again underscored by the testimony of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell, representative of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association and president of the University of Arkansas, when he noted that:

Most of the proposals before Congress involve increasing the supply of students, while the primary need of our colleges and universities is for help with which to make it possible to educate the students now enrolled and to be enrolled, whether measures to increase this number are adopted or not.

This is not to say that there is no place for scholarship and loan programs and we do not wish to be categorical on that, but we do say that if we want to talk about quality education we have to talk about more than increasing the supply of students in the colleges and universities.

I just say that we often debate in this country now the either-or of quantity and mass education as against quality. Certainly we need to do both; that is, we need to educate all the people and we need to provide quality education at every level.

I cannot speak too strongly in support of these measures to provide graduate fellowships.

Baccalaureate-degree graduates, particularly in science, engineering, and mathematics, have many immediate and well-paying offers of employment in industry. The alternative road to a doctoral degree and qualification for high-level basic and applied research and teaching is long and the financial problems serious, particularly at the normal time of marriage and establishment of a family. Adequate fellowship help is essential.

The vital need for this program was outlined more fully in Dr. Caldwell's prepared statement for the subcommittee in which he asserts:

The provision of additional and substantial graduate fellowships is essential in both the long and short run. It will have an early impact on our supply of highly qualified personnel. Baccalaureate-degree graduates, particularly in science, engineering, and mathematics, have many immediate and well-paying offers of employment in industry. The alternative road to a doctoral degree and qualification for high-level basic and applied research and teaching is long and the financial problems serious, particularly at the normal time of marriage and establishment of a family. Adequate fellowship help is essential.

We need to strengthen and expand graduate schools through the Nation and one very practical way to do it is to give aid to qualified graduate schools and to award some fellowships through the graduate schools.

The House Committee on Education and Labor report on the proposed National Defense Education Act—House Report 2157—points to this same necessity for a fellowship program:

One great need of the Nation is to increase the number of highly trained persons produced by the graduate schools of our universities. There is a special need to increase the number of graduates who will teach in the colleges and universities since today the number of persons with the degree of doctor of philosophy (the standard degree for college teachers) who enter teaching is decreasing. For example, a recent study found that among 629 colleges and universities in 1956 a total of 1,196 teaching positions remained unfilled. In 1953-54, 40 percent of all college teachers held doctoral degrees, but in this same year only 31 percent of new college teachers had such degrees. Three years later the latter figure had dropped to 23 percent, which represented a serious loss.

Only some 160 institutions of higher education confer earned doctoral degrees. About 80 confer fewer than 10 degrees each and between 25 and 30 award more than 100 each. Thus, about 75 institutions conferring between 10 and 100 degrees provide a considerable potential for increasing the output of graduate doctoral degrees. With some financial assistance to these institutions and financial aid to graduate students, graduate education will be materially expanded.

A majority of the full House Committee on Education and Labor concurred with the testimony presented to the subcommittee, thus decisively substantiating the demand for Federal assistance in this area. As the committee reported:

The expressed aim of the program is, in addition, to further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

The program would provide for the award of 1,000 fellowships for the first year and 1,500 for each of the 3 succeeding years. Fellowships can be retained for 2 years following the initial year of award.

Fellowship holders will receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study following the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year and \$2,400 for the third such year. An additional amount of \$400 for each such year will be awarded for each dependent of the fellowship holder.

Fellowships are to be awarded by the graduate schools of universities following approval of the Commissioner of Education based upon a finding that the graduate program of the university has been expanded or is a new program. On the basis of such finding, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution the sum of not less than \$500 or not more than \$2,500 per academic year which is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of a new graduate program or the expansion of an existing graduate program which is reasonably attributable to each fellowship authorized to be awarded by the approved institution.

Holders of fellowships will be required to maintain satisfactory academic

standing and to devote essentially full time to study or research in the field in which the fellowship is awarded. Fellowship holders will not be permitted to engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment by the institution in teaching, research, or similar activity.

I believe that the report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School and the facts presented to the House subcommittee by prominent leaders in the field of education constitute more than ample evidence of a role to be fulfilled by the Federal Government in the expansion of graduate education programs in the United States. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 under the provisions of title VI would establish this vital Federal assistance.

Defense Reorganization for Essential Military Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be called upon to exercise our responsibility of enacting legislation essentially needed to provide military unity and restrain the unhappy rivalries existing among the separate branches of our armed services.

We can each have sincere and conscientious differences as to the precise legislative provisions to accomplish the desired objective. For instance, some of us very earnestly feel that the right of the individual services to come directly to Congress with complaints and recommendations should be preserved, while others do not so feel. Some of us may disagree as to the retention of congressional veto power over changes in combat functions within the services, but few of us will disagree that, in time of war or imminent hostilities, the President's power should be unlimited.

Despite any differences that Members may have about the measure to be presented, the bill, in my opinion, does provide some substantially forward steps. It is designed to give the Defense Secretary clear power to assign weapons to services of his choice and to centralize research and development under a single director. The power of unified commanders over all forces under them ought to be, and is, spelled out to prevent conflicts of authority among and between rival service commanders.

It is our clear duty to conscientiously attempt the enactment of a measure that will remove, so far as reasonably possible, the disastrous jealousies that admittedly exist among the services, and that will provide for the centralization of research and development under one director, in order to stop the appalling waste of

center of the greatest city in the world. This is a project in the finest tradition of civic planning.

But slum clearance is not the cause of better housing. It is the result, the end product of a soundly planned rehousing program.

WMCA believes that, before a single building is torn down, subsidized public housing, equal in quantity to the number of families to be evicted and the rentals paid in those buildings must be built to house the tenants. You can put a side of beef in cold storage for a year. You cannot do the same to an American family.

Nearly twenty thousand human beings are being evicted or will be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project. WMCA believes that our immediate and pressing problem is to address ourselves to helping them. Let us not neglect their plight. Let us not forget that rehousing is for people.

Neglected Areas of Education and the National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 21, 1958

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to fully realize what it means to live during times of explosive scientific development. Now we know that man's entry into space is limited only by the boundaries of time needed for research. This scientific research is man's last barrier to new adventure and discovery in the universe. Only an educational system alerted and equipped for the times can trigger a projection capable of surmounting science research barriers.

In the interest of the national survival we must provide stimulus to the States for the improvement and the further development of their public school programs of education and training in the sciences and foreign languages. We have more than sufficient evidence of the immediate dire need for this type of assistance to our public schools. In fact, as the committee reports on H. R. 13247 stated:

There is no question as to the need for strengthening and expanding the teaching of mathematics, science and modern foreign languages in our elementary and secondary schools. The vital importance of these subjects to our natural defense and to the conduct of our foreign economic, cultural, and diplomatic relations is inescapable. Instruction in these subjects—utilizing modern techniques and equipment—must be adequate at the elementary and secondary school level if we are to produce the educated people our Nation needs in the years ahead. The plain cold fact is that these subjects are neglected ones in all too many of our schools today.

Dr. Lawrence Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education, described the background of the situation when he testified before our committee that—

It scarcely needs to be said that we have entered a new era, an era unfolding as a

result of new knowledge of the universe and the continued development of new sources of energy. In many respects what recently was in the future, as conceived in the minds of men, is already here. We have been startled by recent developments and the accelerated pace with which the doors to nature's secrets are being opened.

The relative recency of the entrance of the laboratory sciences into the curriculum undoubtedly is one factor limiting the character and degree of science offerings in the schools. Many of our schools never have had suitable laboratory facilities, and in school after school the few science courses that are taught are often of a very inadequate nature, with instruction by teachers with less than desirable qualifications for the task. In recent years even the more favored schools have suffered sharp limitations on their science programs, as we shall show. These and other conditions have contributed to a critical imbalance in the curriculum, instruction, and student enrollment. . . .

Today most of the States do not have the leadership needed to promote the necessary modernization and upgrading of instruction in mathematics and science.

Resulting in part from lack of personnel, most of the States have not developed modern mathematics and science courses of study and teachers' guides.

The need to improve the science curriculum in our public schools is described in an article by Mr. Elbert P. Little in the Science Teacher Magazine, as follows:

The teaching of science has changed, and changed substantially, in the half century, both in content and in technique. But on the whole, the changes have consisted in addition to the structure that existed 50 years ago, or in alterations to the existing structure. Lately there have been repeated intimations that this piecemeal reconstruction has long since failed in its purposes; that a new structure is now necessary; and that it must be designed from the ground up.

The expense of equipment for science laboratories has forced many schools to resort to nonlaboratory methods of teaching. In many instances, it was reported during our subcommittee hearings, it is not uncommon to find a complete absence of laboratory facilities in the required general science and biology courses, to say nothing of those sciences requiring more complicated and expensive laboratory equipment.

The cost of science laboratory facilities was outlined by Dr. John R. Ludington, of the United States Office of Education, during our hearings when he pointed out that—

A general science laboratory would run \$6,000; a biology laboratory, \$6,700; and physics labs tend to run about \$9,600; chemistry laboratories a little higher—\$12,600.

In addition to those figures, we have various items of student apparatus and teacher demonstration equipment, chemicals and consumable supplies.

These figures for a general science laboratory run about \$1,200 to \$4,300, depending upon the size and the desires of the school. A biology laboratory would run from about \$3,200 to \$8,200. A physics laboratory would run from \$3,400 to \$8,900; and a chemistry laboratory, \$2,400 to \$7,200.

The problem of the lack of adequate science facilities and equipment in many of the Nation's schools is further complicated by the most vitally important

need of all—a shortage of science and mathematics teachers. This fact was underscored during the subcommittee hearings when it was pointed out that—

A number of factors contribute to the difficulties which school systems face in developing adequate programs of mathematics and science. However, let us consider the problem of the teacher. Certainly all of us would agree this is a prime factor. It applies in other fields, of course. But the shortage is considerably more severe in the fields of mathematics and science. Moreover, the preparation of those presently engaged in these fields is less adequate than in other subjects.

The competition for teachers qualified in mathematics and science is definitely more critical today than heretofore. Several States which have conducted studies of teacher supply in science and mathematics report that only about one-third of the science teachers are full-time teachers of science and two-thirds teach these subjects merely on a part-time basis. Information drawn from 32 States indicates that in 1956 less than half of both the science teachers and mathematics teachers were devoting full time to the subject. This situation is most common in small high schools.

There has been an alarming drop in the number of science teachers trained annually. In 1950, 9,096 qualified science teachers graduated from our colleges. In 1956, only 4,320 were graduated a decrease of more than 50 percent. A slight improvement over the latter figure was noted in 1957 when the number increased to around 5,000. Moreover, for a variety of reasons, of those graduates prepared to teach science only about 60 out of every 100 actually accept teaching positions. In contrast, more than 80 percent of those who prepare for elementary school teaching enter teaching immediately.

On the basis of these facts and additional evidence presented to our subcommittee it is my opinion that the provision in the proposed National Defense Education Act to provide Federal assistance to the States to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction is urgently needed and fully warranted.

As outlined in the committee report on H. R. 13247:

This title authorizes grants to the States to assist over a period of 4 fiscal years in establishing and maintaining a 2-part program for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in public schools, both administered in accordance with a single State plan (as approved by the Commissioner of Education) for accomplishing the purposes of the program.

First, there is authorized the appropriation of \$60 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of special equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in the public elementary, and secondary schools of the State, and for minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such equipment.

Secondly, there is authorized the appropriation of \$5 million for each of the 4 years for payments to State educational agencies for the expansion or improvement of State supervision and related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction, and for the administration of the State plan.

Appendix

Is Rehousing for People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 24, 1958

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely able address entitled "Is Rehousing for People?" which was delivered by Nathan Straus, of New York, one of the leading experts in the entire housing field during the last 25 years. In his stimulating and interesting address, he pointed out the enormous difficulties with which we are faced in connection with the relocation of families by reason of the urban redevelopment and the highway programs and the complete inability to deal with those programs in the absence of adequate housing for families of low income.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS REHOUSING FOR PEOPLE?

(By Nathan Straus)

Is the objective of an urban redevelopment and rehousing program to help people or to beautify the city? The question is not intended facetiously. It comes to mind almost inevitably, if any serious study is made of the effect of the New York City redevelopment program.

We are informed that about 5,000 families will be relocated over the next 3 years in connection with the building of the Lincoln Square project. The word "relocated" is a convenient evasion of the fact that these unfortunate families are being thrown out of their homes—many of them, with nowhere else to go.

Here are a few typical examples, as reported in the daily newspapers.

A 70-year-old widow occupying an apartment for which she pays \$36.80 per month is one of those evicted. She has been unable to find an apartment except at a monthly rental of \$50. That is, she will be forced to pay one-third more rent than she has in the past. It is true that she will receive a one-time relocation bonus amounting to \$312.92. But that money will be swallowed up in moving expense and the increase in rent, in less than a year. Her case is typical rather than unique.

Another family consisting of a man, his wife, their baby son and his wife's mother—four in all—occupy a flat for which they pay \$22.70 a month. It consists of 4 rooms, so the rent is less than \$6 a room. The apartments to be built on the Lincoln Square site are going to rent for upward of \$47 a room. As one of the evicted tenants says: "We couldn't even rent a closet in them."

The real-estate concern in charge of relocation frankly admits that it has only 400 apartments available in all parts of the city and that these apartments rent for from \$50 to \$85 a month.

It is a fact that 1 family out of 4, now living in the Lincoln Square area, is theoretically eligible for an apartment in a subsidized public housing project. However, the eligibility is largely a theoretical benefit, an empty gesture, since, in fact, there is a long waiting list for apartments in public subsidized housing in this city.

Even though many of the tenements in the Lincoln Square area are firetraps and even though many of them may be vermin infested, nevertheless, on a cold night, any roof over the family's head is better than a park bench.

The plight of low-income families, to be evicted in connection with the Lincoln Square project, is characteristic of urban redevelopment throughout the United States.

Things are no worse in New York than in any other American city—except that redevelopment of slum areas has proceeded at a more rapid pace here than elsewhere. While our newspaper headlines read "High Rent Apartments Still the Trend in Manhattan" and "Lincoln Square DP's Ask the Planners: Where Do We Go?" as far out as the west coast, the pattern is duplicated.

One of the worst examples of mismanagement in the United States is that of the city of Los Angeles. There, a fine program of subsidized public housing, approved by the Federal Government, was rejected by the voters, just as it was all ready to go into actual construction. This negative result was the product of a campaign of vilification and misrepresentation by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the United States Savings and Loan League, unfortunately abetted by the two leading newspapers of that city.

The outstanding success achieved by this campaign of misrepresentation by the real-estate lobby is well indicated by the fact that even as generally reliable and distinguished a representative of the Nation's press as the Wall Street Journal on July 17, 1951, printed the following headlines: "Los Angeles Folk Fume Over Huge Project," "Roar of Protest Against Public Housing."

The truth was that the city council had approved the public-housing program by a vote of 10 to 5. The truth was that the public-housing program had been endorsed by every local veterans' organization, all local-labor organizations and more than 70 other civic groups.

The low-income families of Los Angeles are today paying the penalty for the success of this vicious propaganda. Thus the New York Times, writing of the Los Angeles project on last June 8, reported, under the headline "Vast Building Plan Is Set in Slum" that "the 9,000 present residents of the hill will be resettled, virtually all the buildings in the 22-block area razed, and the tract re-landscaped and rebuilt to accommodate 6,000 to 8,000 residents in style. What will become of the people who live in the firetraps and rabbit warrens atop the hill is an unsettled question. The redevelopment will be on somewhat a luxury basis, with apartments renting upward from \$50 a room a month."

It must be unpleasant indeed to be the head of a family, worrying about where to find a roof to shelter wife and children, only to be informed that his fate is an unsettled question. Tearing down slum buildings may be esthetically satisfying and emotionally soothing but does not, of itself, improve the

living conditions of low-income families. On the contrary, it may aggravate their plight.

The basic fact is, that even with Government aid under the FHA program and other forms of assistance, very little of the new housing provided by private speculative builders is within the means of even a family of average income. Obviously none of it is within the means of families in the lowest income groups, those who, of necessity, are compelled to live in slum areas.

About one-quarter of the families in the United States can afford to buy the cheapest new three-bedroom houses available at the end of 1957. Three-bedroom apartments are even scarcer and even more expensive than three-bedroom houses. A three-bedroom apartment rents for a minimum of about \$110. This condition is true across the Nation. To afford such apartments, a family should have an annual income of not less than \$7,000.

The problem of rehousing is essentially a national one that can be solved only on a basis of national financial assistance. WMCA calls again for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Government.

Moreover, WMCA would like to suggest that, just as a would-be automobile manufacturer in another country comes over here to study what has been done so successfully in Detroit, or physicians and surgeons come to New York City study the best in medical science, so officials in charge of our urban redevelopment and rehousing program might well study what has been done successfully abroad—especially in England and in Sweden.

According to Mr. Eric L. Bird, editor of the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, "In Britain new construction generally precedes slum elimination." This, let it be noted, is said of a housing program that has been continued under Conservative and Labor governments, with only minor modifications since 1922. The 2 top years of public housing construction in England were under Conservative governments—in 1928 and 1939.

In Sweden, which has carried out, in the opinion of qualified observers, the most successful rehousing program anywhere in the world, the philosophy of housing and the pattern followed is similar.

The best of Sweden is represented by Vellingby, a new satellite town a few miles outside of Stockholm. It was completed last year. Vellingby is not a group of tall apartment houses, huddled together in a few acres. It consists of hundreds of acres, laid out as apartments, individual homes, groups of two-story housing for elderly people, playgrounds, recreational parks, decorative fountains as well as wading pools. There are restaurants, there are bandstands. There are office buildings, where employment will be provided for those who live in the new city. There are sites available for leasing to private concerns, on which factories will be erected, to provide more employment. This is real redevelopment, having as its key a better life for the people of Sweden.

Let it be understood that WMCA has nothing but admiration for the ideals of urban redevelopment and specifically for the Lincoln Square project, which will replace a rundown area of antiquated tenements and superannuated buildings with a cultural

A6691

*BEST COPY
AVAILABLE*

This legislative program marks the Federal Government's first clear recognition of the vital relationship of education to the strength and security of the Nation. The renewed encouragement and respect which the bill will bring to the pursuit of intellectual excellence will, in the long run, contribute most significantly to the solution of our educational problems.

Mr. President, it was my original intention to offer an amendment reducing the number of scholarships provided in the bill. However, I have decided not to press this amendment, in light of the House action on last Friday which entirely eliminated the scholarship title from the House version of the bill.

In the belief that it now seems advisable to go to conference with a larger scholarship program, and in the interest of getting to conference as quickly as possible, I shall seek passage of Senate bill 4237 substantially in the form in which it was reported to the Senate.

I am deeply disturbed by the House action in regard to the scholarship title.

The scholarship program proposed in the bill symbolizes national recognition of the importance of intellectual achievement. It gives added integrity to the guidance and testing provisions of the bill by creating a further impetus for highly talented students to pursue a higher education. The competition for national defense scholarships will challenge a large number of students, thereby stimulating a State-by-State reexamination of educational standards.

These purposes are eminently desirable, and are entirely distinct from those of the loan program, which simply aims to broaden the opportunities for able students to go to, and remain in, college.

I agree with the President that 10,000 scholarships will provide an adequate program for these purposes. The present bill authorizes approximately 13,000, a substantially larger number. However, I now feel that a reduction of the scholarship title by the Senate would make it difficult to come out of conference with a program large enough to be meaningful.

Therefore, Mr. President, my conclusion is that the Senate should pass the bill in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate—including the provision of 23,000 scholarships, because by proceeding in that way, probably we shall be able to arrive finally at a position for a reasonable number of scholarships. In view of the fact that in the House the scholarship provision was eliminated, it is my hope that as a result of the procedure I now propose, the scholarship figure finally reached by the conferees will be in line with the President's recommendation for 10,000 scholarships.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other day all of us had much to say

about the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will soon terminate his service in the Senate. We spoke in glowing terms which were entirely deserved.

Today, we have the honor of noting his participation in connection with this historic Education bill. His efforts in this connection certainly warrant all the encomiums which have been heaped upon him. I think for his own satisfaction it is well for him to know that we said what we did, not merely because we are very fond of him, but because our statements were based on the kind of solid achievement which is evidenced by the historic contribution the Senator from New Jersey has made to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend from New York for his kind words.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just made a very important, indeed, a historic, speech to the United Nations on the Middle East.

His essential points are:

First, that our Nation will aid the small nations to maintain their independence. We have shown we are willing to do that, even at the risk of the commitment of our forces.

Second, that a United Nations force should be created to deal with the problem of direct and indirect aggression.

Third, that monitoring of radio broadcasts should take place, as radio can be the organ for indirect aggression, as Radio Damascus and Radio Carlo have shown in the last few days.

Finally, that the great American example of the Marshall Plan of self-help and mutual cooperation should be carried out through a Middle East Economic Development Corporation, by the Arab nations themselves, if they wish to join in it under the guidance and leadership of the Secretary General of the United Nations, to which we will contribute.

The President's speech shows the sincerity and good faith of the United States, and it shows that we mean to exert our best efforts to unite the free world. It should be clear, also, that our country will not be blackmailed or diverted from its discharge of free world leadership for world peace.

The speech points out the constructive aspects of Arab nationalism, and shows a respect which should impress anyone who is not trying to get together a private power empire, but who has a true respect for Arab nationalism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read in this morning's newspaper of the President's visit to the United Nations General Assembly, and, of course, I have had the privilege of reading the President's message on the ticker of the Associated Press and the United Press-INS.

I for one want to join the Senator from New York in commending the

President on this act of statesmanship and leadership. The proposals as outlined by the President are very meritorious. As I said some time ago, I thought the period for recrimination and argument was long past. I believe what we need to think about now is the future and the implementation of the proposals.

The President has laid down now a program for the agencies of our own Government, for the United Nations, and, I might add, for the Congress. I am hopeful each and every one of us will give it the support which it so justly deserves.

I was one of those who felt the President should go before the United Nations. I am pleased he has seen fit to do so. He shall have my support in his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to identify myself with the remarks made by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota. I did not have the privilege of following through on the matter, so I am not familiar with the details. I am very happy indeed that our colleagues have realized the effect of the President's personal presence before the United Nations. I am glad the President's contribution to world peace and the strengthening of the United Nations has been emphasized.

ECONOMIC TRAGEDY IN LEADVILLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a short time ago the Senate passed a bill called by the short title of the minerals stabilization program. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News be included as a part of my remarks at this point in the Record. This editorial points up very definitely what the real problem and trouble is with our minerals industry, and how it has reacted in a particular situation in the town of Leadville, Colo.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ECONOMIC TRAGEDY IN LEADVILLE

The 2-mile high city of Leadville is now experiencing its greatest economic hardship since gold was discovered in California Gulch.

As a result of the 18-day-old strike against the Climax Molybdenum Co., there is not a single miner working in the entire area. Only 95 men are employed in the smelter, and they are handling ore from South America.

The bells of Annunciation Church are calling people to daily prayer that the strike might be ended. And well the bells might toll mournfully, for the economic results of this strike have been tragic to the whole city.

More than 1,100 men are out of jobs. The only large payroll in the whole area has been cut drastically. Everyone in the city in one form or another is feeling the pinch.

The strike was called when Climax Molybdenum was forced to reduce its working schedule from 6 days to 5 because of high reserves of concentrates and narrowing markets.

This meant that the men would lose a day's wages at time and a half. With an automatic wage increase of 8 cents an hour in July, the men were receiving an average

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15831

and it goes to the very heart of our problem with the Communist head of the Yugoslavian Government.

I believe that this is a clear-cut interpretation of Tito's methods, and I commend it to the reading of the Members of Congress and the public in general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article made a part of my remarks and printed as such in the body of the Record. In addition, I refer to an editorial which appeared in the same newspaper and published on the same date, entitled "We're Our Own Worst Enemy." This editorial also relates to Communist Yugoslavia, and I ask unanimous consent that it also be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader of Monday, August 11, 1958]

TITO—THE SWINDLER
(By Victor Riesel)

MUNICH.—Evidence of a multi-billion-dollar scandal has just been reported to a trusted few here by a special observer who has been in Tito's Yugoslavia for exactly 1 year.

Ever since Stalin's death, it can now be revealed, Nikita Khrushchev and Marshal Tito have been plotting to defraud the United States of billions of dollars. Until recently, they were intimate personal friends chuckling at the ease with which they have sucked billions of dollars from us.

It is now absolutely certain that they even planned the crushing of the Hungarian anti-Communists long before the ghastly Budapest revolt. Evidence brought into the little briefing room of the crusading Radio Free Europe headquarters here by an objective observer with whom I lunched exactly a year ago on his departure for Belgrade reveals that Marshal Tito disdained the West and approved of the use of Soviet Army tanks and troops in splattering the Hungarian freedom fighters on that grim night in October 1956.

Mark this well, for Tito has our gold and Hungary's blood on his hands—and this gold could have propped up our own Army and our own recession economy.

Tens of thousands of jobs in the United States could have been saved if the gold had gone for paying our roads, building schools and low-cost homes, or simply for military purchases and aid to truly friendly nations.

Evidence that Marshal Tito was certainly not one of our allies or even really neutral begins with his flying visit to Khrushchev in Yalta not long after Stalin's death. There Khrushchev told Tito that the Russians could crush the wayward satellites with tanks, but that they didn't want to be barefisted Fascists before the world. Therefore, Tito, as the so-called rebel highly respected by the dissidents—revisionists, Khrushchev called them—could soothe them into line.

Comrade Khrushchev was particularly concerned over the growing unrest in Hungary. Tito was eager to get back into the green pastures of Moscow's Communist Mecca. So he agreed to try.

This failed. The Budapest revolt, led by Hungarian steelworkers and students, flared against Moscow like some political magnesium. On the night before Khrushchev decided to move in his troops and slaughter women, kids, and men alike, he and his silent colleague, Anastas Mikoyan, secretly contacted Tito.

They asked the Yugoslav's reaction if they shot the workers down in the name of his-

torical necessity. Tito approved. The workers were splattered in Budapest.

There was only one humane act by the fearful marshal.

He did tip rebel Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy that something was about to happen and that Nagy should take refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest.

But on the same morning that Budapest's streets were washed with workers' blood, the central committee of the Yugoslav Community Party issued leaflets in Belgrade saying that the Soviet crushing of the Hungarian uprising was correct in the perspective of history. This leaflet is in the possession of the man who briefed the truly brilliant analyst of Radio Free Europe here.

I was in on this briefing. Add to it one more ghastly Russian move. They had a radio station behind the Khrushchev curtain which broadcast messages to the Hungarians imitating anti-Communist broadcasts, urging the rebels throughout Hungary to continue fighting. Thus Khrushchev provoked more people into the streets and fields and they, too, were slaughtered or captured. Up to this very minute, the survivors are being executed or shipped to prison camps.

That's second act curtain. The third act began recently when Khrushchev decided the time had come when he didn't care what the world thought. Thus he no longer had any use for Tito. Comrade Khrushchev then demanded complete surrender from the elderly marshal. Tito's own Communist Party central committee balked. They felt they had been taken. Inside Yugoslavia now, Tito's control of his own party has been shaken.

He is taking guff from a bloc made up of workers' leaders, military men, youth group officials and anti-Communists such as these in the central committee who still are behind the imprisoned Milovan Djilas. This bloc feels that Tito alienated the United States in the past year by playing with Khrushchev, thus costing Yugoslavia considerable arms and money.

This bloc wants to woo the United States. In retaliation, Tito is trying to drive Djilas to suicide in prison. Tito feels that Djilas who is being deprived of many routine privileges in his horror jail, is the symbol of opposition.

Seems to me a world grand jury should be impaneled to try Tito, the swindler, in a global court of public opinion.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of August 11, 1958]

WE'RE OUR OWN WORST ENEMY

Senator STYLES BRIDGES' one-man campaign to have the Senate Appropriations Committee cut out aid for Communist Yugoslavia and Poland, although unsuccessful, brings nought but credit on himself.

It is indeed one of the great tragedies of our times that only a handful of Congressmen are intelligent enough to see the folly of aiding Communist dictatorships that will turn against us like vicious dogs the moment the shooting begins.

It is obvious that the No. 1 weapon in the Communist arsenal is not the ICBM, nor the hydrogen bomb, nor even subversion and espionage.

It's our own stupidity.

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1958

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 4237.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237) to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of

peace, and assure the intellectual eminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate the development and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof: to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness; to inform our scientists promptly and effectively of the results of research and study carried on in the United States and throughout the world; and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate consideration of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 comes at a time of great decision. A severe blow—some would say a disastrous blow—has been struck at America's self-confidence and at her prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensely about our military position, our scientific stature, or our educational system.

The Soviet Union, which only 40 years ago was a nation of peasants today is challenging our America, the world's greatest industrial power, in the very field where we have claimed supremacy: the application of science to technology.

Americans are united in our determination to meet this challenge. Americans know that we must give vastly greater support, emphasis, and dedication to basic scientific research, to quality in education, to instruction in the physical sciences, to training in foreign languages, and to developing to the full our intellectual, cultural, and scientific resources. Americans know we must mobilize our Nation's brainpower in the struggle for survival.

This is a task for all our people, for both great political parties, for both the executive and the legislative branches of our Government, for the States, the counties, the cities and towns and local communities, for the schools, the colleges, and universities, and for all the other private and public resources that constitute the basis of our scientific and educational endeavors.

The particular task of the Senate is to consider how best to stimulate and strengthen science and education for the defense of our country and at the same time preserve the traditional principle, in which we all believe, that primary responsibility and control of education belongs and must remain with the States, local communities, and private institutions.

The United States truly has reached a historic turning point, and the path we choose to pursue may well determine the future not only of western civilization but freedom and peace for all peoples of the earth.

I believe we all agree that the great motivation for the formation of our Federal Government was the responsibility for what the Founding Fathers called the common defense and for the

conduct of our foreign affairs. From the very beginning this responsibility of the Federal Government has been immediate and direct. The Constitution solemnly placed upon the Federal Government this responsibility for the national defense, as we call it today, and for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Mr. President, speaking on the floor of the Senate some 10 years ago, I said that America's first line of defense is the science laboratory. At the same time, in the same speech on the Senate floor, I declared that foreign affairs are no longer foreign.

If that statement was true 10 years ago, it is true now. There can be no question as to its truth and validity. Surely, America's first line of defense today is in the science laboratory, and foreign affairs are no longer foreign.

We had before our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare many witnesses, including distinguished scientists, distinguished educators, and distinguished leaders in American public life. All those witnesses, without exception, took cognizance of the vital relationship between a good educational system and national survival. Witness after witness testified to the fact that the highest grade of public education, especially in the sciences, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages, is absolutely essential to an adequate national defense. Our first witness, Dr. Detlev A. Bronk, former president of Johns Hopkins University and now president of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research and president of the National Academy of Sciences, stated:

We cannot compete with Russia and China and other potential enemies in terms of numbers of men and women. Because of that, it is especially important that we have a very high level of education in our country in order to compete against greater numbers with men and women of greater competence. Only this way can we defend our national strength and be effective champions and defenders of the human freedoms on which the whole free world depends.

Then Dr. Bronk laid great emphasis on the fact that we must, within the next 10 or 15 years, double the number of scientists and engineers we are graduating from our schools and colleges.

Dr. Edward Teller, commonly known as the father of the hydrogen bomb, in speaking of the situation in the world, and speaking particularly with reference to science education, declared:

The tide is clearly and definitely running against us.

Then Dr. Teller emphasized that we must train more scientists, more mathematicians, more engineers, more persons versed in foreign languages, if we are to turn the present tide and properly defend our country and its freedom. Dr. Teller said, among many other things, and I think this is important:

I am quite sure that in science more than in other fields the young generation is the one which carries the greatest burden, and therefore the children who are now in school will be the ones on whom we will have to depend primarily 10 years from today.

The chairman then asked Dr. Teller: We should now, at this time, do all we can to encourage and help them to move forward and develop as much as possible. Is that not true?

Dr. Teller's answer was:

That is what we have to do or I think our way of life will not survive.

There also appeared as a witness Dr. Wernher von Braun, who made the greatest contribution to the design and development of our satellite Explorer, which, as will be recalled, was our first satellite to be successfully put into outer space. When this distinguished scientist, a man of great vision and knowledge, as demonstrated by the work he did in the development of the Explorer, was before the committee, I, as chairman of the committee, asked him if he thought it important that we go forward with greater emphasis on the training and preparation of scientists, engineers, and technicians, so that we might move more rapidly into the space age. Dr. von Braun's answer was:

Yes, sir; I think it is a matter of national survival.

The Chairman of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers, in transmitting the Committee's second interim report to the President, recently summarized our situation in these words:

Today, Russia has more scientists, engineers, and technicians than the United States, and is graduating more than twice as many each year. Competent American observers report that in certain fields Russian scientific work is comparable in quality to that done here. Certainly the manpower and effort devoted to research and to the education of future scientists exceeds our own.

Mr. President, listen to this statement, which is in the Committee report:

The rate of Russian progress in most scientific fields is so rapid that, unless we broaden and strengthen our own efforts, there is little question of Soviet superiority 5 or 10 years from now.

We recall President Eisenhower's speech in Oklahoma City last November, in which he said, in speaking of the necessity of training, educating, and producing more scientists, engineers, and technicians:

According to my scientific advisers this is for the American people the most critical problem of all.

My scientific advisers place this problem above all other immediate tasks of producing missiles, or developing new techniques in the armed services. We need scientists in the 10 years ahead. They say we need them by thousands more than we are now presently planning to have.

The Federal Government can deal with only part of this difficulty, but it must and will do its part * * *

We should, among other things, have * * * a system of incentives for high-aptitude students to pursue scientific or professional studies; a program to stimulate good-quality teaching of mathematics and science; provision of more laboratory facilities; and measures, including fellowships, to increase the output of qualified teachers.

Mr. President, I could stand on the floor for many hours quoting the leaders

of thought and the leaders of action in science and education in this country. All of them would tell us the same story.

The distinguished Senator from Texas, our majority leader, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness of the Committee on Armed Services, and who is also Chairman of the Committee on Space, heard many witnesses. If Senators will read the hearings before his subcommittee, they will find that witness after witness testified and emphasized that the need for more scientists, engineers, and technicians must be met if we are to meet the challenge, if our Nation is to be defended, and if we are to survive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the generous reference to me by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. No Member of Congress has, over a long period of years, made a greater contribution to his country than has the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am very much pleased and am very proud that under his leadership there has been reported a bill which I think meets the minimum requirements. I hope it will be debated and that the Senate can act upon it and pass it before we recess today.

I hope this bill is only the forerunner of better things to come. After Sputnik I, a committee of this body sat for more than 4 months and heard from some of the great statesmen of our time and some of the most learned scholars of our Nation. I came away from those 4 months of deliberations with one firm conclusion, namely, that we must take advantage of time, money, energy, imagination, and everything else available to us and devote them to our educational system if the Republic is to be preserved.

I think history may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education. We have not gone far enough, fast enough. I do not think the people of the Nation realize the competitive struggle which exists. There must be an awakening, not only in Congress, but throughout the country, and first things must come first.

I know of nothing which has higher priority than the education of our children and their preparation for the needs of the modern world. I know of no one who has contributed more or to whom we can look for better leadership than the solid, constructive, progressive Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I commend him for the great work he has done for so many years in Congress.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend from Texas. I not only appreciate his kind and most generous words because they come from him, but also because there is no man in America who has done more to try to strengthen education, to strengthen the national defense and to insure the survival of our Nation than has the distinguished Senator from Texas. Considering the many

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15833

onerous and overwhelming duties which are upon him, and the burden which he carries, it really has been astounding that he has been able to give so much of his time, thought, effort, and brilliant leadership to the cause of trying to make certain that we meet the challenge, that we move forward as we should, for the defense and, indeed, the survival of our Nation.

I may say one other word in connection with what the distinguished Senator has said, because certainly he speaks with great authority.

As he spoke, there came to me the lines of that wise man of another day, Sir Francis Bacon, who declared:

What man will not alter for the better, time, the great innovator, will alter for the worse.

Unless the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the American people are willing to follow the brilliant, devoted, and distinguished leadership of the senior Senator from Texas, time will alter, and time will alter for the worse. This is our opportunity; this is our challenge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Alabama remind me of the contributions made to my State by a great Georgian, President Lamar, of the Republic of Texas, who went to Texas from Georgia. One of his statements was something like this:

An educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men recognize, and the only ruler free men desire.

President Lamar made that statement more than 100 years ago; but it is just as true today as it was on the day when he made it.

Just as President Lamar, first a citizen of the State of Georgia, made such great contributions to my State, today the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is making a great contribution, in my opinion, not only to the Nation, but also to the entire free world, because it can truly be said that an educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy.

I hope this bill is but a forerunner; but certainly it will produce more educated minds than would be produced if we simply ended the session and went home without doing anything in this field.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his contribution. As I have said before, no one speaks with greater authority than does he, because no one has given more time, effort, and devoted and brilliant leadership to this cause than has the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. We are seeking to support and sustain him in his leadership for the defense of our country and the survival of our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me? Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] in commending the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for bringing this vitally needed education bill before the Senate today. It is a good bill, and one of which my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I are proud to be cosponsors. We are proud to follow the leadership of the great Senator from Alabama, who is doing such magnificent work in this field. Not only is he doing it at the present time, but during the years his work in this field has made his name immortal.

If the Senator from Alabama will permit me to do so, I should like to join in what he had to say about the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. President, the record of accomplishment of the 85th Congress is to be seen in the activities of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. When he is on or about the floor, we can be assured that the situation is well in hand and that progress is being made in the consideration and the disposition of proposed legislation, as is the case at the present time. In my opinion, he is one of the greatest leaders this country has ever produced. He has displayed sagacity, understanding, and tolerance in his dealings with his colleagues on the floor. If any saying can correctly be regarded as an indication of the personality of the majority leader, I believe it is one which he is so fond of quoting from Isaiah: "Let us reason together."

Certainly, the President of the United States should be extremely happy and grateful for the fact that he has, in the person of the majority leader, a man who understands the true meaning of responsibility, statesmanship, and the welfare of the country as a whole. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] would not give much comfort to the theories expounded in the books on political science. However, he has, in a practical way, carried to the summit the art of politics and government. His accomplishments speak for themselves, because what he has done is to weld together the diverse elements of the Democratic Party, and at the same time develop an understanding with the Republican Party in connection with the conduct of business in the Senate. It is not an easy job to create and to maintain a degree of tolerance and understanding among the many individuals who comprise the membership of this body. That this has been done is indeed to the great credit of the majority leader, and it speaks well for the conduct of the legislative branch of our Government.

I would be remiss in my remarks if I did not state that much of this cooperation and a great deal of this accomplishment are due to the harmonious working relationship between the majority

leader and the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Because of the efforts put forth by these two men and by other Members of this body, the 85th Congress will be able to adjourn with a record of accomplishment and of responsibility which no other Congress in recent years can approach.

Mr. President, the bill now under debate is but another indication of the responsibility which the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama are displaying in the conduct of the affairs of the Government.

Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, I should like to ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Yodels for a Texan," which was published in the New York Times of August 12, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to have that done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YODELS FOR A TEXAN—LYNDON JOHNSON
LAUDED FOR GETTING BILLS PASSED WITHOUT
AROUSING ANGER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 11.—When the leaders of Washington, Republican and Democratic, executive and legislative, start yodeling in unison about the virtues of a single Senator, it is fair to conclude that the Senator (a) has just died, or (b) retired from the Senate, or (c) won a very special place for himself in the Capital. This is what is now happening in the case of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas. The Democratic majority leader has not died or retired; he is merely coming to the end of another congressional session in which he has managed to win approval for a lot of controversial legislation without making anybody angry.

Other Senate leaders with large majorities and powerful Presidents have pushed through more legislation, but it has seldom, if ever, happened that so much controversial legislation has gone through a divided Government with so few cuts and bruises.

IN TROUBLE AT FIRST

When the 2d session of the 84th Congress started last January, the administration's foreign economic program was in serious trouble. Mr. JOHNSON himself feared that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the foreign-aid appropriations would be cut to pieces. Both have come out, not precisely as the administration wanted them, but solidly intact.

Much the same was true of the Pentagon reform bill, but it, too, has survived the interparty and interservice rivalries. Of all the really major objectives, only the labor bill is still in trouble, and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who taught JOHNSON much of his parliamentary skill, may save that at the last minute.

All this, of course, is not Senator JOHNSON's doing alone. He has developed a strange but genuine partnership with the Senate Republican leader, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California. He worked closely with Mr. RAYBURN and the House Republican leader, JOSEPH MARTIN.

On the tariff, he had intelligent support from C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, who is one of the few good things that has happened to the State Department recently, and on Pentagon reorganization, he established a firm and even

affectionate alliance with Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense.

Nevertheless, everybody from President Eisenhower to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN agrees that Senator JOHNSON is primarily responsible for the record and nobody quite knows how it was done.

Even Under Secretary Dillon, who followed the tariff bill for the State Department, cannot explain even yet how Senator JOHNSON disentangled the bill from a number of complicated, personal, and parliamentary difficulties.

It is impossible to have a conversation with Senator JOHNSON on the subject. Nobody has a conversation with the Texan. He does all the talking all the time and his talk is as detailed and complicated as his tactics.

As a strategist, he is the best quarterback to come out of Texas since Slingin' Sammy Baugh. He seldom originates legislation himself, but he can take complex human beings and ideas and select or invent ways and means of winning consent for effective compromise legislation.

His assumption is that the Senate is not a seminar in theoretical political ideology but a workshop for passing laws, and while this emphasis on parliamentary skill has earned him the reputation of a political mechanic, it is probably significant that even the theorists in this city are beginning to join in his praise.

Next to his gift for dealing with complicated details and cantankerous human beings, vitality is his great strength. This is one of the odd paradoxes in a very complex man. He has had a severe heart attack and yet burns up more energy than a tank.

Washington is very conscious of this quality at the moment. The heart of the trouble in the executive branch of the Government is the lack of sustained energy at the center. It is not that there are no ideas or programs but that there is very little driving force in the White House to carry things through.

Senator JOHNSON, like President Eisenhower, has political power. But, in addition, he allies immense energy to skill and ideas. The ideas may come from other men, but he will work 18 hours a day putting the thing over and, because he has both political power and physical energy, he achieves objectives other men cannot reach.

He has his weaknesses, like other mortals. The major defect in Congress is that everybody is working on a few trees at a time, and few manage to see the whole forest. Senator JOHNSON does not escape this episodic and narrowing aspect of the Congress, yet even here, his record is better this session than last.

Part of the reason for this is that he has developed an excellent staff in his office. He discovered during the civil-rights debate in the last session that the intellectuals of his party outside and inside the Congress could be useful in defining goals and devising compromise legislation, and he is now using them more than ever before.

As a result of all this, he will go home at the end of this session with broader support within the Democratic Party and the press than he has ever had before. For his cheering section now runs from John Foster Dulles to Dean Acheson, and from HUBERT HUMPHREY to HERMAN TALMADGE, and that is quite a distance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], surprised me. I was about to leave the Chamber, when I heard him speak about me.

I wish to say that, unworthy as I am, I am very grateful that I have friends like him; and I shall try to be humble, worthy, and dedicated to the better things of life which he so well represents.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that the cause of education, the cause of the defense of our Nation, and the cause of survival for our Nation, have no better, truer, or more devoted friends than the two distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD]. They always give of their time, their thought, and their best efforts, in working and fighting for the cause of education for the defense of our country.

I know of no better indication of the accuracy of what the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said regarding the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], than the fact that I had no disposition to bring up the pending education bill until I could be sure that the distinguished majority leader would be on the floor.

The testimony of witness after witness before our committee showed very clearly that this Nation must more effectively discover and encourage potential intellectual talent, create wider opportunities for advanced training for gifted young people, and provide better teachers and better teaching equipment to develop the scholastic resources of American youth.

A study conducted by the United States Office of Education indicates that during their high school training only 1 out of 3 students takes a chemistry course; only 1 out of 4, physics; only 1 out of 3, intermediate algebra; and only 1 out of 8, trigonometry or solid geometry. The report shows that about 100,000 seniors attend public high schools where no advanced mathematics of any kind is taught. Sixty-one thousand are in schools which provide instruction in neither physics nor chemistry. Last year 14 States did not require a single course in science or mathematics for graduation.

Mr. President, we know that there is nothing so important for the transmission of ideas as a common language. Yet we find that our people in the United States are about as poorly versed in foreign languages as the people of any great nation could perhaps be. I think the testimony before our committee, given by many eminent witnesses who spoke with authority, could well be summarized by an article which appeared in the New York Times just a few days ago, July 27 last, which stated as follows:

Last winter, at the height of the concern about the content of Russian education, the United States Office of Education obtained the thirty-odd mathematics and science textbooks used in the Soviet elementary-secondary schools.

Six months later—and 10 months after sputnik—those books are still largely unevaluated, because the Office has been unable to find persons with dual competence in Russian—

That is, the Russian language—and in the subject matter—

That is, the scientific subject matter—to make comparisons from partial translations with American school texts.

This is one illustration of the consequences of the poverty of the American schools' offerings in modern foreign languages and foreign cultures, an area ranked in importance immediately behind science and mathematics.

Testifying for legislation intended to help provide more and better language teaching, administration officials last winter told congressional committees that for a nation with worldwide interests we are linguistically unprepared either to defend ourselves in the case of war or to exercise the full force of our leadership in building a peaceful world. They said we are linguistically the most backward major nation in the world, that few Americans available for overseas assignments have had any foreign language training.

In other words, we have to send representatives of our Government and of our Nation to other nations who cannot even speak the language of the other nations, who cannot exchange and transmit ideas, because they cannot speak the common language.

This lack of language preparation on the part of our representatives overseas has been a major handicap in our foreign policy. Because of this deficiency, our representatives are too often unable to engage in the kind of person-to-person relationship which plays such a vital part in many aspects of our foreign affairs, as well as in gaining friendship for our country throughout the world. All of these facts underline the urgency for action now. Fully trained and competent personnel, whether the training be in science, mathematics, technology, or foreign languages, cannot be produced overnight. There can be no crash programs in this type of education. America's position 5, 10, or 20 years from now will be determined largely by what we do today.

While I speak of the compulsion of the hour, of the compulsion to act today, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a few excerpts from the report which the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Derthick, made upon his return not many days ago from Russia. Dr. Derthick, as will be recalled, accompanied ten American educators to Russia, and upon their return Dr. Derthick said:

The slogan we saw most in posters, films, and everywhere was Reach and Overreach America.

Dr. Derthick went on to say:

In education the spirit is a race for knowledge, for supremacy in a way of life and in world leadership. The Russian attitude is, as one Soviet official told us, "We believe in a planned society, you in individual initiative. Let time tell."

And Dr. Derthick added:

They—

That is, the Russians—

are convinced that time is on their side and they can win world supremacy through education and hard work.

This conviction is basic—

He said—

to all of their efforts and all of their plans for the future. Education is paramount. It is a kind of grand passion—this conviction that children, schools, and hard work will win them their place in the sun, and on the moon.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15835

Dr. Derthick summarized the situation by reporting the following evidences of a total Soviet commitment to education:

Classes are of reasonable size.
Teachers are chosen on a highly selective basis.

Then he added:

We saw no indication of any shortage (of teachers).

Foreign languages are widely taught.

The educational process extends after school hours and during the summer under professional direction.

Teachers and principals have an abundance of staff assistants; curriculum experts, doctors, nurses, laboratory assistants, and so forth.

School money is available to do the job.

He added:

We were told repeatedly, "A child can be born healthy, but he cannot be born educated."

Dr. Derthick concluded:

These factors insure vigor and quality in any school system, whether in a communistic society or a democracy.

Then Dr. Derthick added these words about the trip to Russia taken by him and the 10 other educators:

What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular; we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U. S. S. R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education. Our major reaction therefore is one of astonishment * * * at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished.

Mr. President, that is the challenge which faces us today. That is the challenge which faces us as Members of the United States Senate, in this legislative body of the Federal Government, with its direct and immediate responsibility for the defense of our Nation and, in part, for the conduct of our foreign affairs. This brings home to us in emphatic and ringing terms the fact that our Nation must more effectively discover and encourage its potential intellectual talent, must create wider opportunities for advanced training for gifted young people, and must provide better teachers and teaching equipment so as to develop the scholastic resources of American youth.

If we are to do that, Mr. President, nothing is more important than that we provide incentives to encourage, to stimulate, and to challenge the boys and girls, the youth of America, to develop to the fullest, to make the most of their God-given talents, to train their minds to think, to train their minds to work, to train their minds to analyze, and, when possible, to create.

Of course, this was the thought President Eisenhower had in his mind in his speech last November in Oklahoma, when he urged that Congress pass legislation to provide these incentives, these encouragements, these stimulants, and these challenges to the youth of America.

In reporting S. 4237 to the Senate, the committee has approved a coordinated program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's

brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in learning.

Scholarship awards are offered to stimulate and challenge high-school students to do their best, and to stimulate parents to insist not only that their children work hard, but that their schools provide the proper courses of instruction. Additional scholarship grants based on need will also aid scholarship winners to complete a 4-year college education. Student loans will be available to other highly qualified college students needing financial assistance.

A limited number of fellowship grants are offered those who advance into graduate school to obtain their doctoral degrees and thus better qualify themselves to be college instructors.

Secondary- and elementary-school teachers will have the opportunity to attend special institutes where they may increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Able students will be encouraged to become teachers by a forgiveness feature in the student loan program under which recipients who later enter the teaching profession will have their loans canceled in 5 years at the rate of 20 percent for each year they teach.

The bill provides for aptitude testing of children as they are entering high school, in order to identify the particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually, can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high-school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college.

Provision is made for research and experimentation in the use of television and other modern mediums of communication for educational purposes.

To enable students to secure the most benefit from courses in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, grants will be made to State educational agencies, on a matching basis, for purchase of modern laboratory equipment.

To help meet the defense and foreign relations needs of the Nation, language and area centers will be provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples, especially those in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Soviet Union.

To help assure an adequate supply of technical personnel to assist scientists and engineers, area vocational educational schools will be created to give instruction in techniques and skills essential to the national defense.

To assure that scientists and researchers shall have available to them the latest developments in their fields, there is established a Science Information Service for indexing, abstracting, translating, and distributing to American scientists the findings of scientific research throughout the world.

We recognize, of course, that the primary responsibility for a sound educational system in our country in the future, as in the past, rests with the States, the local communities, the parents, the colleges, and universities, and to this end we specifically and categorically provide in the pending bill that no Federal officer shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution.

But, Mr. President, we can adhere steadfastly and wholeheartedly to this policy and at the same time provide Federal aid, as set forth in this bill, because we have many illustrations of Federal aid which has been provided without interference and without any attempted control on the part of the Government, and in connection with which we have left the primary responsibility with the States, the local communities, the parents, the colleges, and universities.

We of the committee recall that when the very able and distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, was before our committee, he emphasized this very proposition.

Before the Federal Union came into being, in 1785, there was passed the first ordinance making large grants of land to what were to be the States of these United States for educational purposes.

Two years afterward, in 1787, there was passed what is commonly known as the Northwest Ordinance, which, incidentally, Daniel Webster stated was the greatest law of any, because of its recognition of education and because of the large land grants made for the cause of education.

Senators will recall that in the ordinance of 1787 it was declared:

* * * knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the maintenance of education shall be forever encouraged.

And then, as we know, at a later date, in 1862, there was passed what is commonly known as the Land Grant College Act. In that connection, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that when a similar measure was first passed by the Congress it was vetoed by the then President of the United States, President Buchanan. If Senators will read President Buchanan's message vetoing the bill at that time, they will find pretty much the same arguments made about that bill as are being made against aid for education today. But the Congress in its wisdom and with its vision broadened repassed the bill. We then had another President of the United States, a man who, by hard struggle through difficulties and adversity, had won for himself an education, a man of far greater wisdom and vision, Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln signed the bill into law and gave to us our great land-grant college program. In all the nearly 100 years we have had that program no one has ever come forward with any serious charge that the Government has in any way sought to interfere with or attempted to control the great colleges established under that act.

Of course, we are all familiar with our vocational education program, which came into being at another time of great stress, the time of World War I. The act was passed in 1917. The needs and the necessities of that great struggle brought home to us the need for a program for vocational education, and the Congress passed that act. In all these years the program has worked with great success and provided many, many benefits for the people and for the Nation, without any question of Federal interference or attempted control.

We all know what the Government of the United States has done under the GI bill of rights. In all these different programs the Federal Government has responded to special national needs in education without Federal interference or any attempted control by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, we must pass the proposed legislation because it will stimulate a more rigorous training of the intellects which we must have to meet the challenges to our Nation today. The proposed legislation recognizes that intellectual discipline is essential to our national purpose. Passage of the bill will do much to encourage the American people, and bring them to a fuller realization that we must have in America people with understanding of the process of learning and with respect for knowledge and intellectual attainment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield when he feels the proper moment has arrived?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am distinctly gratified by that portion of the bill which deals with the student loan fund, and I shall support every phase of it, including the scholarship provision.

The distinguished chairman of the committee is entitled to the gratitude of all the people of the country for rendering such a monumental service and drafting legislation so needed in the national defense. He has been able to reconcile a great many diverse points of view and to arrive at a sound conclusion.

I had the privilege of testifying before the committee in connection with the proposal outlined in Senate bill 1727, which I introduced, and which was sponsored also by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Payne], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. That bill called for substantially the program now set forth in title 3 of the bill in direct loans to State agencies, in almost the same amount. We asked for \$250 million.

There is another phase of that program about which I should like to ask the Senator, and that is the idea of a \$750 million revolving guaranty fund, to apply an FHA type of guaranty to student loans, made either by State agencies, by banks and other institutions, or by educational institutions themselves.

There are certain fiscal limitations; and certainly the bill before us shows that attention has been paid to the fiscal limitations. The type of approach

which I have in mind is the technique which has been employed in connection with housing, and which might be employed in connection with education, in order materially to expand student loan opportunities. All of us must recognize the essentiality of the student loan approach, in order to enlarge the possibilities with relation to scholarships, no matter how generous we might wish to be in the field of scholarships.

I am delighted with the bill. I believe the Senator from Alabama has rendered a great service to the country. The Senator from New York was interested in knowing whether any consideration had been given to the FHA type of approach in connection with the student loan program, going beyond the program in the bill.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York made a very fine and helpful statement before our committee.

In reply to his question, there is a loan program in the bill, but not the FHA type of program to which the Senator has referred. There is a loan program in the bill, but not that particular type.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator feel that the door is open for the consideration of that type of program if enough supporters can be found for it?

Mr. HILL. The door is open. I will say to my distinguished friend what the distinguished majority leader said earlier. I believe that this bill is the first step. In a short time the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in consultation with other Members of the Senate, such as the distinguished Senator from New York, who is very much interested in this subject, will consider most carefully another step that should be taken to promote the aims and purposes we have in mind in bringing this bill before the Senate.

As chairman of the committee, I assure the Senator from New York that the proposal which he presented has received my study, and will continue to receive my most careful thought and study.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I hope that next year those of us who are still in the Senate will join in an effort to put the proposal in the form of legislation.

I thank my colleague, and congratulate him for the monumental service he has rendered to the people of the country.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York is most generous and kind. However, the bill is the result of teamwork. Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare seek always to work as a team, and they did work as a team in bringing this bill before the Senate.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith] and also the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Education. The bill was the work of the team, in an effort to bring before the Senate the best possible bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I join my colleague in recognition of the work of the other committee members. When I spoke of the chairman, I was speaking of him in a representative capacity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I might continue for many hours discussing this subject. Our committee held hearings, the printed record of which comprises some 1,700 pages of testimony. We sought to go into this subject with great care, and with the consideration which the challenge compelled.

I close by quoting the words of Edmund Burke, spoken some 200 years ago. He declared:

Education is the chief defense of nations.

Burke has long been held to be perhaps the foremost and most prophetic of British statesmen. Surely those words were words of wisdom. "Education is the chief defense of nations." Those words have a peculiar and appealing application to our country today.

At a little later date Horace Mann, the great pioneer and leader in the American public education system, declared:

Education is our only political safety. Outside of this ark all is deluge.

In 1920, about 38 years ago, one of the foremost historians in the record of nations, H. G. Wells, declared:

History becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

I could select no words which would better summarize the situation which confronts us today, and the challenge which faces us as Senators and faces the American people, than those words:

History becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

The bill before the Senate, as reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bespeaks the determination of an aroused American people, and of both great political parties, to unite in an effort to meet the present challenge to the defense of our country, the present challenge to the survival of our nation, and to insure the continued intellectual eminence of the United States. It is a challenge to keep America strong that we may keep America free.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not desire to interrupt the Senator in his very stirring address, but I wish to express to him at this time my appreciation for the many hours, days, and weeks of fine and devoted service he has rendered in connection with the hearings and in the drafting of the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

In doing so I also wish to pay tribute to the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], and the other members of the committee, who also have worked very hard on the bill—not without disagreement—in bringing the proposed legislation to its present point. I particularly wish to express publicly my appreciation for the fine and great work which the chairman of the committee has done on the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank my distinguished friend from Colorado. The record will

show that in all the days and weeks we considered the bill the distinguished Senator from Colorado was always there. We held many hearings—mornings and afternoons, and many hours of executive session, both by the subcommittee and by the full committee—and the man who, always was there, making his contribution and giving us the benefit of his fine thought and work in the cause of education, was the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I thank him for the many fine contributions he has made to the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, before I begin my own remarks on the subject I wish to associate myself with the fine remarks which have been made by the majority leader and by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] with regard to the services rendered by the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in this work. The Senator from Alabama and I have been members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 14 years, and in our struggling through many hearings in the consideration of many subjects we have acquired an approach which is free of partisan politics, which is as it should be in considering these subjects.

Aside from my great personal affection and respect for the Senator from Alabama, I wish to commend him particularly for his willingness and eagerness to confer on this type of proposed legislation, which has to do with the security of our country, on the basis of an all-American front, which all of us are trying to work for, and without considering politics. I have in mind particularly his participation, for example, in the conferences we had with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from time to time when the bill was progressing in committee, and his cooperation with my good friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who was the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

My association with these Senators has been one of the bright spots of this year and of all the years I have had an opportunity to work in this field of human welfare. I congratulate the Senator from Alabama on his inspiring presentation of the subject today.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that on Thursday of last week I endeavored to speak of my appreciation of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and particularly to express my deep regret that this is his last session as a Member of the Senate. In my remarks on last Thursday, I referred to the fine cooperation which has existed between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Alabama, and how intimately and closely we have worked together. I wish to say again today that no one could have had a finer or better teammate than I have had in the Senator from New Jersey.

As the ranking minority member of the committee, he has been there all the time, making fine contributions and doing everything he could through his efforts and his leadership to serve our

country and to bring forth a bill which would do the very best for the United States of America. I thank him and congratulate him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, beginning on line 10, it is proposed to strike out all after "shall be given" through line 14, and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

(A) To those persons whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and (B) primarily to persons with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's amendment very much improves and strengthens the language in the bill. He called attention to this matter in committee when we were considering the bill. He has given his best thought to this subject, and I believe the amendment improves and strengthens the bill. Certainly it clarifies it. It is a good amendment, and it should be adopted. I hope it may be approved at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator. I believe it is a clarifying amendment and a good amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I endorse everything the Senator from Alabama has said about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the consideration of the pending bill, consultants to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may have the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I strongly urge the passage of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958. I believe it offers a sound and necessary emergency program which will strengthen our educational system significantly. Its approach is similar to both S. 3163, the administration bill which I introduced, and S. 3187, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator HILL. The committee bill, S. 4237, represents a reasonable compromise between the two points of view. They and other bills were of great help in our effort to get together on the pending bill.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

I do not claim that this bill will solve all the serious educational problems which handicap our schools today. No one bill, and no amount of Federal funds, could accomplish that purpose.

What this bill attempts to do is to strengthen the national defense through the fuller development of our potential

national resources of talented manpower. Section 101 declares that:

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will demonstrate our country's recognition of and esteem for those of our students who have striven to develop their intellectual abilities to the fullest extent; will make available greater intellectual opportunities challenging to our youth; will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational program which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology; and will provide means to make it possible for our teachers to enrich their knowledge of the subject matter which they teach.

To put it another way: in this first year of the space age, the interests of national security require that the more effective mobilization of our national manpower should receive the top priority for Federal action in the field of education.

Last February when Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Foreign Relations Committee, there occurred this colloquy:

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think that a substantial effort directed to increasing the quality of our educational system would tend to improve our military posture relative to the Soviet Union?

General TWINING. I think that is probably the most important thing this country can do.

Similarly, when President Eisenhower gave his state of the Union address last January, he listed among our imperative needs an education program designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security and complemented by a major expansion of the National Science Foundation's activities in science education.

To strengthen our position against international communism, the President warned, we must make maximum use of our tremendous potential resources in education, science, research, and, not least, the ideas and principles by which we live.

The bill provides the means for utilizing these resources more effectively. As such, it should be considered as an integral part of the national defense program, an essential security requirement. This is clearly the way the President intended his education program to be considered.

THE LAG IN THE EDUCATIONAL EFFORT

The bill, then, will strengthen national security by strengthening the Nation's educational system. Certainly there is overwhelming evidence that the system needs strengthening. The recent Rockefeller brothers report on education was simply restating a well-known fact in its declaration that:

Our schools are overcrowded, understaffed, and ill-equipped. In the fall of 1957, the shortage of public school classrooms stood at 142,000. There were 1,943,000 pupils in excess of normal classroom capacity. Some elementary and high schools and colleges

15838

had found it impossible to hire well-qualified teachers in such basic subjects as English, languages, and social sciences; some have even had to drop chemistry, physics, and mathematics from their curriculum since there were no teachers to teach them.

It is tragic that this situation has been precipitated by neglect. We, as a people, have too long taken for granted the great free system of public education which has been such a vital factor in shaping our national destiny.

The damaging lag in our educational effort has become a matter of increasing Federal concern in recent years. In 1955, 1956, and 1957, the Eisenhower administration proposed broad programs of aid for school construction.

Then suddenly, almost overnight, the rush of events symbolized by the launching of the Russian sputniks gave new emphasis and clarity to national security requirements. The administration had to revise its education program in the perspective of these requirements. As a result, school construction was temporarily deferred, and top educational priority was placed on the program embodied in the bill now before us.

THE DEFERMENT OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

This shifting of priorities has been both widely misunderstood and unjustly criticized. It is time to speak frankly on the subject.

One of the factors in the decision to defer school construction was its entanglement in the issue of school integration. After the tragic incidents of last fall, the division of national opinion on desegregation as reflected in Congress strongly indicated that school construction this year had become a practical impossibility. Any consideration of such a bill, it appeared, would inevitably raise the integration question and arouse bitter controversy.

In my judgment, the intervening months have not altered this situation. For this reason I am convinced that an attempt to add a school construction amendment to this bill would jeopardize passage of any legislation this year.

As one who has strongly and consistently supported Federal aid for school construction in the past, I deeply regret the prospect of delaying this much needed assistance for another year. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the administration acted in the best interests of education when it postponed its plans for school construction.

In addition to the fact that significant Federal aid was needed this year to strengthen the schools, there were plenty of strong educational reasons to justify a shift in priorities from classroom construction to the development of talent. I shall now outline some of these reasons.

THE TOP PRIORITY OF EDUCATIONAL NEED: QUALITY MANPOWER

The need to develop more trained, high-talent manpower has long ranked high on the list of educational priorities. It is a need which has increasingly troubled farsighted leaders in government, industry, and education. Many of them have repeatedly urged that this problem should receive primary attention.

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, warned in early 1955 that:

If there is to be another * * * war among the great nations of the world * * * such a war will almost certainly be lost by the country with the fewest resources in trained manpower.

General Electric Corp., in the fall of that year, took full-page advertisements in national newspapers to state that:

For every 5 new engineers industry needed this year only 3 were graduates from United States colleges. We have opportunities for a thousand more technically trained people each year. The need may double in the next 10 years.

The Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy reported in July 1956 that:

The shortage of skilled talent in this country is a very real problem and one with which we must come to grips if we are to maintain the present rate of growth which is so essential to the Nation's strength and well-being.

The report noted, for instance, that the shortage of skilled manpower in the field of nuclear energy is the greatest single deterrent to progress in our atomic energy program. At the same time, the committee stressed that such shortages should be understood as part of a total shortage of trained individuals in every field, and concluded that our main objective should be the development of all our intellectual resources.

EDUCATORS CALL FOR HIGHER STANDARDS

Educators in particular have voiced their concern over the need for higher quality in education.

This spring, the educational policies commission of the National Education Association summed up the contemporary challenge to American education as necessarily involving at the least, increased attention to the gifted young people in schools that are designed for all young people, improved guidance in planning programs suited to individual talents and capacities, and improvement in teaching and the status of teaching.

Several weeks ago, at their annual meeting in Cleveland, NEA delegates heard John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, urge the abolishment of the cult of easiness in the schools. He charged that the schools, backed by parental indifference, have failed to meet the needs of talented students, and that intellectual excellence does not rank high enough in our values.

A Gallup poll last spring which, unfortunately, did not receive the attention it deserved, revealed that a solid 79 percent of the Nation's high-school principals feel today's schools demand too little from their students.

A subsequent poll of American parents illustrated that the public has not yet fully grasped the importance of strengthening educational standards. In contrast to the school principals, the parents polled were not concerned by the inadequacies of the curriculum so much as the lack of bigger and better classrooms. With the school men, the priority of importance was reversed.

The Rockefeller brothers report, while rightly pointing up the critical need for greater public support of education, dealt principally with the problem of quality. This emphasis was made clear in its title, "The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America," and amplified in its text:

At the precollege level, the gravest problem today is to reach some agreement on priorities in subject matter. This problem is particularly critical for those academically talented students who will go on to college. Particularly with respect to the highest priority subjects, we must modernize and improve the quality of the courses themselves.

The report found further that—

The crisis in our science education is not an invention of the newspapers, or scientists, or the Pentagon. It is a real crisis. * * * The heart of the matter is that we are moving with headlong speed into a new phase in man's long struggle to control his environment, a phase beside which the industrial revolution may appear a modest alteration of human affairs. Nuclear energy, exploration of outer space, revolutionary studies of brain functioning, important new work on the living cell—all point to changes in our lives so startling as to test to the utmost our adaptive capacities. We need quality and we need it in considerable quantity. We must develop guidance efforts designed to reach all able youngsters, and we must engage in a major expansion of the facilities for science teaching.

The evidence is undeniable that an imbalance has developed in our educational system which has led to insufficient attention to mathematics, science, and modern languages in the curriculum of the average high school. The scientists themselves, however, readily agree that the primary need is for a general strengthening of the whole curriculum. Speaking for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Laurence H. Snyder, dean of the graduate school of the University of Oklahoma, made this statement before the Labor Committee last February:

The primary requirement in education today is to improve the quality of education, especially education in science and mathematics. We need more and better school buildings. We need to pay our teachers more adequate salaries. We need to overcome the handicaps that prevent some bright students from attending college. But, above all, we need to offer education in higher quality to the students who will be the teachers, the statesmen, the scientists, and the leaders in business and other fields of tomorrow.

THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE

The need for greater stress on quality education has been brought into sharper focus in the last 10 months by the dramatic evidence of Russian progress in science and technology. As Dr. Howard Bevis warned last fall in submitting the report of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers:

Today, Russia has more scientists, engineers, and technicians than the United States, and is graduating more than twice as many each year. * * * The rate of Russian progress in most scientific fields is so rapid that, unless we broaden and strengthen our own efforts, there will be little question of Soviet superiority 5 or 10 years from now.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15839

The committee report itself declared:

Not only our self-interest but this country's inescapable obligations to the free world demand that we do not allow our technological progress to fall behind that of a power which seeks to challenge the free world economically, politically, and militarily.

Sputnik I proved that these warnings of approaching crisis were not exaggerated, and that we had actually fallen behind the Russians in some fields.

The central fact about the Russian challenge is that it is based on a "total commitment to education," as Commissioner Derthick observed in June after a month-long study of Russian schools. In the Soviet's grand strategy to achieve world technological supremacy, education is the primary weapon.

In a remarkably short span of years, Russia has progressed from a nation of illiterates to one with millions in the schools. These millions are the servants of the state, pawns in the Communist strategy. They are given a strong curriculum and forced to meet high educational standards. Attractive rewards are provided for intellectual accomplishments, and special incentives encourage superior minds into scientific and technological fields. Teachers are chosen on a highly selective basis. They are well paid, and are given abundant staff assistance.

The Russian emphasis on education is only just beginning to produce results. Our real problem of competition will come in another decade. This fact places on us the heavy responsibility for action now. Education is a long process. As Dr. Detlev Bronk told the Labor Committee last March:

What we are doing now educationally is going to affect our position and our status nationally 10, 15, and 20 years from now. There can be no crash program in education.

EDUCATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

We do not know, and we cannot say, that sputnik was a direct result of Russia's commitment to education. But sputnik was a stark dramatization and symbol of Russian scientific and technological progress. As such, it was a clearcut mandate for action to develop our manpower resources more effectively. This is essentially an educational problem. Therefore, from the standpoint of the national interest, it has become the most critical educational problem.

Certainly too, in the development of our manpower we must place our hopes on quality. Our Nation of 170 million is obviously unable to match our opponents in terms of quantity when the Communists' total commitment to education is supported by the 800 million people of Russia and China.

MAJOR AREAS OF WEAKNESS

Faced with the Russian challenge, we must acknowledge that we are neither developing nor using our national brainpower and technical talent to anything approaching full capacity. We must not permit this waste to continue. To do so would be to imperil the national security just as surely as would an undermanned, undertrained military force.

What, then, are the most important areas in which Federal action can help to strengthen the educational system? Exhaustive study and consultation with educators throughout the country by the Office of Education, and detailed expert testimony during 3 months of hearings by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has produced general agreement on three principal areas in which the weaknesses of the educational system are particularly apparent, and in which Federal aid could contribute added strength to an important degree.

These three areas are: the identification and motivation of talent; the training of teachers, particularly in scientific subjects; and the teaching of these subjects, particularly at the secondary level. I shall discuss each one.

1. THE NEED FOR TALENT

First, the identification and motivation of talent.

The estimate of the Office of Education is that, each year, between 100,000 and 200,000 young people in the top quarter of their class either drop out of high school before graduation, or, having graduated, do not go on to college.

This is a shocking index of wasted manpower. It is apparent that, unless we greatly expand the opportunities for all students to develop their talents according to their ability, we simply will not have enough highly trained, highly educated men and women in future years to meet the demands of our growing economy or maintain the vitality of our democratic processes or uphold our position of leadership in the struggle of the free world against communism's atheistic totalitarianism.

Therefore, it should be a matter of prime concern to all Americans that a top-quality education is readily available to all who have the capacity for it.

2. THE NEED FOR TEACHERS

Second, the training of teachers. The teacher shortage is particularly acute at the college level. The need for more qualified college teachers was singled out by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School as the most critical single problem facing higher education today.

The graduate schools of the Nation are turning out only a small proportion of the doctors of philosophy needed to meet the anticipated bulge in college enrollments expected in the years just ahead. If our most talented youngsters are to develop their maximum educational potential, the teachers must be there when they are needed.

Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage the graduate schools of the country to expand their facilities and enrollments now, and to stimulate more students to consider a graduate education as a preparation for teaching.

At the secondary level the teacher shortage is particularly acute in the field of science, mathematics and languages. The biggest single reason why so many students graduate from high school with inadequate preparation in these subjects is because there are not enough teachers to teach them.

Half of our high schools, mostly the smaller ones, offer no modern language training at all. Better paid jobs in private industry attract more than a third of the already inadequate number of men and women trained to teach science and mathematics. Only about a third of today's teachers of science and mathematics majored in those subjects in college.

Our future national level of scientific achievement is directly related to a restoration of the proper balance of science to the curriculum. Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage higher standards and greater interest in secondary teaching in these fields.

3. THE NEED FOR STRENGTHENING CURRICULUM

Third, there is the critical need for a more balanced program in fundamental academic subjects, particularly in science, mathematics and languages.

Only about 1 out of 3 of our high-school graduates have taken chemistry, only 1 out of 4 physics, 1 out of 3 algebra, and 1 out of 8 trigonometry or solid geometry. At a time when it is so essential to make ourselves understood throughout the world, less than 15 percent of our high-school students study any foreign language. By contrast, all students in Russia's 10-year schools are required to study foreign languages for 6 years, and the average Russian student receives 5 to 6 times more mathematics and science instruction than is generally required in American schools.

It is in the national interest that our young people obtain better training in the fundamentals of science, mathematics, and languages. Those who have interest and ability in these subjects will then be more likely to discover and develop their talents. They will not have a scientific or technical career foreclosed to them later due to the lack of a solid curriculum in high school. And, whether or not they enter technical fields of specialization, all students will then carry into their careers a broader and deeper understanding of the modern world which will make their contribution to the Nation greater.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

I have listed three areas of need which require a nationwide effort. It would be unrealistic to expect each local school district in America to act as promptly as today's circumstances demand. Therefore, the Federal Government must assume a share of the responsibility.

The Federal role should be to encourage and assist—not to control or supplant—State, local, and private effort. It should provide leadership by calling attention to critical national needs, and by offering incentives for the States and communities to adopt effective plans to meet these needs. In this way the interests of the people as a whole will be served, and the basic American premise that education is primarily a local, State, and private responsibility will be maintained.

HOW THE BILL STRENGTHENS EDUCATION

Senate bill 4237 provides for a 4-year emergency program which will strengthen the educational system in each of

the three principal areas of weakness which I have discussed.

First, the identification and motivation of talent. In this area the bill provides a series of interrelated programs.

Matching grants to the States will finance a regular program of testing to identify the abilities and aptitudes of all secondary school children. Under the same provision, guidance and counseling programs will be promoted in the public schools to encourage students of outstanding ability to prepare themselves for higher education.

A meaningful program of national defense scholarships will place a premium on academic achievement and give added integrity to the guidance and testing provisions. The program will be large enough to challenge a great number of able students. The resulting competition will provide added impetus for them to seek higher education, and will stimulate a State-by-State reexamination of educational standards. The scholarship program will, in effect, symbolize a new national recognition of the importance of intellectual excellence.

A broad student-loan program will result in a major expansion of opportunity, literally assuring that every qualified student will have a chance to attend college.

A limited and highly selective national defense fellowship program will provide further motivation for the ablest students to engage in advanced study in their fields.

While the scholarship, loan, and fellowship titles stipulate that special consideration shall be given to those with superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern language, I should like to stress that this language in no way limits the students' complete freedom to select their own courses of study or to choose their own colleges or universities.

Second, the need for teachers. Two titles of the bill will provide particularly effective aid in this critical area. They are the student-loan and the graduate-fellowship programs.

The loan program not only gives preference to students who plan to teach; it also provides forgiveness of the loan for those who actually engage in teaching. This program will effect a large-scale increase in the number of able students preparing to teach, since it offers an incentive at the very time when the financial burden of completing an education is a most serious deterrent to entering such an underpaid profession. It will also reduce the loss of prospective teachers and other talented students who, due to economic hardship, drop out of college.

The fellowship title offers awards primarily for persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education. Each fellowship also carries with it a cost-of-education grant to the institution if it undertakes to expand its graduate program for the training of college teachers. Thus, more outstanding teaching candidates will be encouraged to pursue advanced study; and the graduate schools will be encouraged to enlarge their teacher-training programs.

The third of the points we should consider if we are to bolster our educational system is as follows: The need for strengthening curriculum and teaching. Here, matching grants to the States will provide funds to strengthen science, mathematics, and foreign-language instruction in the public elementary and secondary schools. The money will be used to acquire laboratory and visual-aid equipment, remodel laboratory facilities, and expand the supervisory services of the States in these fields. Funds will also be allotted for loans to enable private schools to purchase similar equipment.

A program of teacher institutes will be established by the Commissioner of Education, through contracts with the colleges and universities, for the purpose of improving the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance, modern foreign-language teaching, and the teaching of other subjects "in which shortages of adequately trained teaching personnel are impeding the national defense effort."

These institutes will complement the National Science Foundation's institutes for mathematics and science teachers, which are being greatly expanded this year, as recommended by the President, and will make it possible for teachers of all the so-called hard-core subjects in the curriculum to enrich their knowledge of the subject matter which they teach.

Teaching effectiveness will be further aided by a federally sponsored program of research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, film strips and other audio visual techniques—a study which will encourage the States and local educational agencies to make better use of these mediums.

OTHER AREAS STRENGTHENED BY THE BILL

Senate bill 4237 also provides for the setting up of several programs which promote the more effective use of the national intellectual resources in other areas of specialized need.

In addition to the institutes set up to improve the qualifications of language teachers, the Commissioner will be authorized to establish centers for language and area studies, particularly in the languages of the Middle East, Asia and Africa. These centers will help meet the pressing need for Americans whose knowledge of the languages and customs of foreign countries qualifies them for overseas service in the Government or in business or industry.

Another title expands the existing vocational education program "to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments." This provision reflects substantial testimony as to the increasing shortage of scientific technicians who are needed to support our scientists in the conduct of their research.

Another title directs the National Science Foundation to establish a Science Information Service. The discoveries and theories of foreign scientists will be made more readily available to our own scientists and scholars

through more effective translation and dissemination of scientific information from abroad.

The final title of the bill contains a provision for matching grants to improve the statistical services of the State educational agencies. This is needed to obtain a sound evaluation of our national strengths and deficiencies in education. At the present time, Commissioner Dertthick testified before the Labor Committee, we have "less information about our children than we have about our hogs."

FAR MORE THAN A SCHOLARSHIP BILL

It should be obvious by now that this is not a scholarship bill, much less a science-scholarship bill, as the press has persisted in describing it. Such a description hinders public understanding of the bill, because the scholarship program is but a component part of this legislation, no more important than the several other parts. The heart of the bill lies in its several closely related programs for the early identification of talented students and their guidance and motivation toward the fuller development of their abilities.

In this view, scholarships are not the principal means to the objective. They are, rather, an additional incentive, a reward for achievement, a tangible evidence of the Nation's serious interest in the encouragement of intellectual excellence.

Far more than a scholarship bill, this bill is what it declares itself to be: namely, a bill which provides a program to strengthen the national defense by promoting the fullest development of our potential resources of talented manpower. I believe that, under the present circumstances, this kind of emergency program must have the top priority for Federal aid to education.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BILL

Finally, I wish to declare my confidence that the enactment of this bill will have far-reaching significance for American education. I am convinced of this for several reasons:

First, The bill will provide effective Federal leadership in bringing about a general strengthening of our entire educational system.

Second, It will retain primary responsibility for education where it traditionally belongs. Its system of matching grants will stimulate greatly increased efforts in support of education on the part of the States, the local communities, and private sources.

I wish to emphasize that point the center of gravity of education in this country must remain in the States, the local communities, and the private sources; that is of paramount importance.

Third, and most important to my mind, is the more intangible, long-range influence the bill will have on the national attitude toward education.

Most of our fundamental educational problems—poorly paid and poorly qualified teachers, inadequate classrooms, anachronistic school districting, and the rest—have their roots in our national failure to place intellectual achievement high enough in our scale of values.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15859

our coastline, or the laurel which grows out of our soil so profusely throughout our State. These ships were built by skilled mechanical and scientific Connecticut know-how in the yards of the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp. They were foreshadowed by the first submarines which were the production of the brains of John Holland and Simon Lake. The Connecticut communities of New London and Groton have lived with submarines and submariners since there have been either.

Mr. President, the great skill of our Connecticut workmen responded to the dynamic vision and leadership of Admiral Rickover to production of these atomic marvels which have sailed under the North Pole to mark new and great scientific strides of mankind.

We in Connecticut, like our fellow citizens throughout the Nation, took great pride in these feats. We were particularly pleased that our State—the great manufacturing arsenal of our Republic—which has pioneered in the air, on the ground, and on the sea, has once again contributed to further knowledge of the undersea world of the submerged polar region.

In behalf of my fellow citizens, I wish to extend our congratulations to the officers and men of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* and to suggest that this body officially commend and salute these new beacons of the atomic age and the personnel who manned them.

At the same time, Mr. President, I am writing to the Postmaster General suggesting that the first commemorative 4-cent stamp be a replica of the *Nautilus* and that it be issued in recognition of the first undersea polar voyage.

Finally, Mr. President, all of us in Connecticut are humbly grateful that once again our greatest natural resource—our people—has been permitted by a kind Providence to participate in these most significant events in the furtherance of our national knowledge and of mankind's continuing exploration of the unknown.

I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

CORNELIUS J. DANAHER

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, following my brief remarks, editorials from the Hartford Courant, from the Hartford Times, both of August 2, and the Catholic Transcript of August 7, 1958, in tribute to one of Connecticut's most outstanding citizens and its oldest practicing lawyer, Cornelius J. Danaher, 87, who recently died at his home in Meriden, Conn.

Mr. Danaher was a personal friend of two presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover, and the father of John A. Danaher, now judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and a former member of this body; Francis R. Danaher, a former mayor of Meriden, Conn.; Cornelius J. Danaher, Jr., a judge in the Meriden Municipal Court; and

Lawrence Danaher, a real estate and insurance man in Meriden.

A member of St. Joseph's Parish, Meriden, he was named a Knight of St. Gregory by Pope Pius XII in 1957.

The oldest living practicing attorney in Connecticut, Mr. Danaher, who was admitted to the State bar in 1893, served as State Labor Commissioner of Connecticut from 1939 to 1944, and he was known as the father of the State Workmen's Compensation Act which he helped put through the State legislature in 1933. Long a champion of the underdog, Mr. Danaher was counsel for the Connecticut Federation of Labor for more than 40 years and appeared year after year at the General Assembly urging passage of labor bills. In addition to his work with the Compensation Act, he established mercury poisoning as an occupational disease and wrote the clause limiting baseball activities to either the American or National leagues. A lover of baseball, Mr. Danaher owned the Meriden and New Haven teams from 1904 to about 1918.

Mr. Danaher, or Connie, as he was popularly known throughout the State, was indeed a talented man, a brilliant orator, and a faithful and devoted public servant. His activities and accomplishments during his career will long be remembered.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times of August 2, 1958]

CORNELIUS JOSEPH DANAHER

Some measure, large or small, of "Connie" Danaher's infectious enthusiasm always rubbed off on all who knew him. It made no difference whether that friendship was a passing and casual one or an intimate association of long-years standing. He had that type of ebullient personality that is rare among men.

Cornelius Joseph Danaher died Friday morning at his home in Meriden, the city of his birth (August 10, 1870), where he was active throughout his long life. The range of his interests was broad and varied. He served his church, his city, and his State with distinction for more than half a century.

Graduated from the Yale Law School in 1893, he quickly plunged into public affairs in which his interest remained keen and alert throughout his life. He was a stout advocate of all the causes in which he firmly believed, a skilled orator of the old school whose resonant and dramatic voice held many a group in rapt attention. He was a debater whom no one cared to tackle unless fully informed on the subject at issue.

For many years Mr. Danaher served as counsel for the Connecticut Federation of Labor and in that period vigorously supported before general assembly committees many pieces of progressive legislation in the interests of the working man. He served as State Labor Commissioner from 1939 to 1944.

Cornelius Danaher was a man of genuine charm and high spirit. He had a ready anecdote to fit most every situation. He was a sympathetic and helpful friend to all who came to him in need of counsel.

Connecticut has lost a faithful and devoted public servant whose good works will be his most lasting monument.

[From the Hartford Courant of August 2, 1958]

Connie Danaher had an unfailing interest in people and things. Whether he was tell-

ing you about James Gates Percival, a strange Connecticut genius, or the records of the New Haven and Meriden teams he used to own in the old Eastern League, his booming voice, winning ways, and smooth command of the language fascinated his listeners. He was a fighter with strong convictions, but he was also a charming companion, a devoted family man, and a hard-working lawyer.

Yet, when you say all those things, how do you sum up Connie Danaher? You've missed his record with labor, first as attorney for the Connecticut Federation of Labor and author of the State's Workmen's Compensation Act—which averaged about \$25 million in payments last year—later as State labor commissioner. You've missed the memory of the political scuffles that Connie gloried in, his appearances at meetings in behalf of candidates, of whom it was said that none lost if Connie Danaher was there to speak for him.

In rough, this was an exuberant man of great personality, of great worth. He was a person who loved life, a man with a touch of poetry on his lips, a fondness for learning, profound interest in human beings, pride in his family and their accomplishments, faith and devotion, and an eternal curiosity that bespoke eternal youth. Any one of these would mark a man. Connie Danaher had them all.

[From the Catholic Transcript of August 7, 1958]

Cornelius J. Danaher, who died last week just before completing his 88th year, was almost as much a feature of the Connecticut scene and as seemingly indestructible as the Meriden hills which he knew and loved from boyhood. A man of many parts, a personality colorful and zesty, he was a conspicuous success as a lawyer, a businessman, a sportsman, a political figure, and a public servant. Gifted with notable intelligence, he was not lacking in sentiment, as anyone who ever conversed with him or heard him on the platform can readily attest. In him these attributes were nicely balanced. He was a vigorous crusader for good causes, earnestly concerned that justice be done and goodness prevail. To the orator's task he brought a ringing voice, a decisive manner, and a sweeping style. He let his views be known beyond mistaking, forcefully supported them with pertinent argument, and exercised unusual powers of persuasion. He was not, like some public men, an actor of a dual role, one thing when before the general run of people, another, quite different thing in private. Always and everywhere he was consistently himself; he had integrity of a high order. A sterling patriot, devoted to his family, an ardent and active member of the church, he shed luster on them all. His was a long, crowded, wonderfully good life, during which he made many his beneficiaries.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANTS FOR CONVERSION OF SALINE WATER TO WATER SUITABLE FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, which were, on page 3, line 5, after "five" insert "experi-

15860

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

mental"; on page 3, line 12, after "processes" insert "and each plant shall demonstrate a different process"; on page 3, line 12, strike out all after "processes." down through and including line 16, and insert "A decision with respect to the process to be utilized in the first of these five plants shall be made by the Secretary within 6 months after the date of approval of this joint resolution and decisions with respect to the processes to be utilized in the other plants shall follow at intervals of not more than 6 months, and the construction of such plants shall proceed as rapidly as is practicable."

On page 4, line 3, strike out "Such" and insert "The sea water conversion"; on page 4, line 11, after "States;" insert "and"; on page 4, strike out lines 12 through 16, inclusive; on page 4, line 17, strike out "(C)" and insert "(B)"; on page 4, line 19, strike out "Territorial possession" and insert "Territory or island area"; on page 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out "and/or additional electric power"; on page 5, after line 21, insert:

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to accept financial and other assistance from any State or public agency in connection with studies, surveys, location, construction, operation, or other work relating to saline or brackish water conversion problems and facilities for such conversion, and to enter into contracts with respect to such assistance, which contracts shall detail the purposes for which the assistance is contributed. Any funds so contributed shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary in like manner as if they had been specifically appropriated for purposes for which they are contributed, and any funds not expended for these purposes shall be returned to the State or public agency from which they were received.

On page 5, line 22, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert "Sec. 4."; on page 6, line 1, strike out "five-year" and insert "seven-year"; on page 6, line 4, after "Congress," insert "Upon such sale, there shall be returned to any State or public agency which has contributed financial assistance under section 3 of this act a proper share of the net proceeds of the sale."; on page 6, line 5, strike out "Sec. 4." and insert "Sec. 5."; on page 6, after line 11, insert:

Sec. 6. When appropriations have been made for the construction or operation and maintenance of any demonstration plant under this act, the Secretary may, in connection with such construction or operation and maintenance enter into contracts for construction for materials and supplies, and for miscellaneous services, which may cover such periods of time as he shall consider necessary but in which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being available therefor.

On page 6, line 12, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert "Sec. 7."

And to amend the title so as to read: Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 135, request a conference with the House on

the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the proposed action is agreeable to the minority leader.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. KUCHEL, conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES FOLLOWING THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be kind enough to point out the measures to which he referred when he talked to me earlier today, which he desires to call up for consideration and which have been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. ANDERSON. They are Calendar No. 2248, S. 3648, and Calendar No. 2255, S. 1887.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Order No. 2248, S. 3648 was introduced by the Senators from New Mexico. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navaho Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating project of the Colorado River storage project.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Also Calendar No. 2255.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 2255 is S. 1887, and was introduced by the Senators from California. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like all Members of the Senate to be on notice that we will have a call of the calendar tomorrow. Following the call of the calendar it is my intention to call up several bills on motion. I anticipate that the Policy Committee will clear these bills. I should therefore like the Senator from Mexico to be prepared—as he always is, although I should like to give him advance notice now—to answer any questions with respect to these bills, if any should be raised. Does the Senator from New Mexico have in mind any other bills?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at this time. I thank the majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last winter, when the proposal for a Federal scholarship program first received widespread attention in the Congress and among the public, I had occasion to set forth my views with respect to such a program, as compared with a Federal-aid-to-school-construction program, in a brief article for the periodical Oregon Higher Education. This is a publication of the Oregon Education Association, edited by Dr. David D. Darland.

In this statement of my views for Oregon Higher Education, I explained why I believe a program of Federal financial assistance to grade and high schools to be the basic need of educational progress in our country, even though I also approve thoroughly of the idea of Federal scholarships which is now before us. I quoted from an exchange of correspondence which I had on this whole subject with our able and dedicated Senate leader in the field of education, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL]. Of course, I have been a sponsor of the Federal aid to education bill introduced by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], S. 3311, as well as my own S. 777.

Rather than review at this time in detail the reasons for my views on these subjects, I ask unanimous consent that my statement for Oregon Higher Education of the issue for winter 1957-58 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Long before the publicity of the sputniks led the administration to propose to Congress a plan for science scholarships, I favored some program of Federal support for students at the university and college level. But it is my conviction that such a program should not single out science study, and that it must take second priority to the financial needs of improved primary and secondary education in our country.

If we had unlimited funds we could do everything at once. But I think Federal scholarships are the dessert of education—very much worthwhile, but not quite as imperative to our total educational effort as adequate and effective schooling in the elementary and secondary grades. Every part of a meal is important, but I suppose a family of limited means would buy meat and vegetables first and then spend money on the dessert.

I believe a sound foundation comes first, whether you are educating a citizen or erecting a skyscraper. The grade school and the high school comprise the foundation. College is the superstructure built upon such a foundation. The foundation is of prime importance.

University and college scholarships are necessary if all our talented young people are to have the opportunity to develop their brains and skills. But these young people will not be prepared to make the most of that opportunity on a college campus, unless they have the earlier benefit of sound schooling in the grade and secondary levels.

I believe that men like Fermi, Einstein, Teller, and Oppenheimer have been as much the products of their grade schools and high schools as they have been of college

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15861

laboratories and graduate schools. An illiterate cannot enter Oxford or Heidelberg and become a genius; something has had to happen earlier. That is why I strongly urge that college scholarships be goals in and of themselves, and never substitutes for a sound and thorough program of Federal aid to more effective education in grade and secondary schools.

Actually, when we discuss the "new" proposals for Federal scholarships, we should never forget that in the decade following World War II this country maintained the largest, most far-reaching and most successful Government scholarship program in history. The educational benefits of the G. I. bill of rights were milestones in our democracy's approach to making up the lost and sacrificed years in the lives of those who fought to defend it. A generation of our skilled and professional workers—scientists, teachers, doctors, civil servants—obtained their higher education under the G. I. bill. This program did not press them into any specific fields of study—their interests, suitability and success, above a necessary minimum, were a matter between them and the academic institutions to which they sought admission.

When the administration permitted the G. I. bill to lapse 2 years ago, I introduced legislation to renew it. Perhaps different conditions of the present time require changes in the format of a Federal scholarship program, although I strongly believe it should contain special provisions for the young men whom we still urge or draft into the Nation's armed forces. And I continue to believe that the Federal Government should first funnel much-needed financial support into our grade and high schools, for example through a school-construction measure such as last year's Kelley bill in the House of Representatives, which I introduced in the Senate.

Thus, when Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, who as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has long been an outstanding leader in the cause of Federal aid to education, recently introduced his Federal-scholarship bill S. 3187, I wrote him as follows in agreeing to co-sponsor this bill:

"It has been my own view that we must not be misled, by the current spotlight which has been thrown upon the immediate production of scientists to meet an apparent Soviet technological challenge, from the fact that it is the quality of our grade school and high school education which will in a major measure determine the reservoir of trained intelligence available to the Nation in the years ahead. There is much merit and justice in a program of scholarships to make available advanced education to those among our brightest and ablest youngsters who would otherwise be financially precluded from it. As you know, I have long proposed revival of the G. I. bill educational program as being in part responsive to that need. I would hope that any Federal scholarship program—whether or not it makes special provisions for servicemen—would not be too predominantly directed at scientific skills.

"However, as I say, I am convinced that measures to strengthen the quality of the curriculum and academic discipline of the grade and high schools are in the long run most essential to meet the educational needs, which are now receiving much widespread attention."

Senator HILL replied, in a very generous letter, that "Like you, I strongly believe that we must buttress our entire educational program at all levels"; that "no one proposal should preempt the field of education"; and that "the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will cover in its hearings all proposed legislation that the Federal Govern-

ment might carry out to strengthen the basic educational structure of our country."

The fact is that, apart from its other shortcomings, the science and language scholarship plan proposed by the Eisenhower administration is—in spite of all the crisis oratory about education following the sputniks—actually a smaller total Federal program than that proposed last year. In spite of all the science-education hullabaloo of last autumn, the administration's 1959 budget actually contains fewer funds for education than that for fiscal 1958. School construction has been forgotten. The administration has even proposed cut-backs in the program to aid Federal-impact school districts. And I need hardly mention that the greatest Federal impact on school needs in recent years resulted from the policy of forcing up interest rates, which added so greatly to the interest burdens and financing difficulties of school construction by local authorities.

As I wrote Senator HILL, I remained convinced that the quality of our elementary and secondary education has a greater significance for our ultimate output of truly educated college men and women than any scholarship program at the college level itself, valuable as that would be. Today, it is the quality of grade and high school education that determines the level at which our colleges and universities can work—not vice versa. Perhaps, as Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has suggested, the universities under the present pressure on their facilities could reverse this by jointly setting uniform academic standards for high-school diplomas to be acceptable evidence for admission. But until now, only a few select centers of learning have been in a position to impose that sort of quality control in selecting freshmen who could maintain a high level of true university work. In most American colleges and universities, now under unprecedented enrollment pressure, the most brilliant freshman has little chance to forge beyond an academic program necessarily geared to the preparation of the normal high school graduate.

That is why I believe that a scholarship program alone is an inadequate response to our currently much discussed educational needs. True, it would permit a number of able and deserving students to obtain an advanced education in our present system. For this reason, I support it. But it seems to me that far greater dividends would be obtained from a program which would help—insofar as money is the need—to strengthen substantially the foundation upon which the subsequent education of almost all college students rests.

A scholarship program alone can help some tens of thousands of our best high-school graduates a year. But a program for grade and high schools that would make possible better facilities, less overworked and better paid teachers with more opportunities for professional preparation, smaller classes with more chance for fast tracks for the college-bound—such a program would help not only those few thousands but all the millions of American college students, by permitting our universities to raise substantially the level and speed of academic work for all students. Having already more young people in college than any other nation, we should not then have to worry about maintaining adequate replacements of academically skilled and professional men and women for America's future. That would be the kind of goals and programs I would like to see the Federal Government support financially.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNAMARA obtained the floor. Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I

may suggest the absence of a quorum, then move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, and at the conclusion of the Executive Calendar the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senate aids will notify all Members of the Senate that we are about to have a yea and nay vote and that Senators should respond to the quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

TAX PROTOCOL WITH UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive A—85th Congress, 2d session—a tax protocol with the United Kingdom.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the supplementary protocol (executive A, 85th Congress, 2d session) between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on August 19, 1957, amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on April 16, 1945, as modified by the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on June 6, 1946, and the supplementary protocol signed at Washington on May 25, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Desiring to conclude a further supplementary Protocol amending the Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on the 16th April 1945, as modified by the supplementary Protocol signed at Washington on the 6th June 1946 and by the supplementary Protocol signed at Washington on the 25th May 1954,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of article VIII of the Convention of the 16th April 1945 for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to taxes on income are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Royalties and other amounts paid as consideration for the use of, or for the privi-

lege of using, copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trademarks, and other like property, and derived from sources within the United States by a resident of the United Kingdom who is subject to United Kingdom tax on such royalties or other amounts shall be exempt from United States tax (a) if such resident is not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment situated therein or (b) if such resident is so engaged, the royalties or other amounts are not directly associated with the business carried on through that permanent establishment.

"(2) Royalties and other amounts paid as consideration for the use of, or for the privilege of using, copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulae, trademarks, and other like property, and derived from sources within the United Kingdom by a resident of the United States who is subject to United States tax on such royalties or other amounts shall be exempt from United Kingdom tax (a) if such resident is not engaged in trade or business in the United Kingdom through a permanent establishment situated therein or (b) if such resident is so engaged, the royalties or other amounts are not directly associated with the business carried on through that permanent establishment."

ARTICLE II

Paragraph (1) of article XIII of the said convention is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Subject to sections 901 to 905 of the United States Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the 1st day of January 1956, United Kingdom tax shall be allowed as a credit against United States tax. For this purpose—

"(a) the recipient of a dividend paid by a corporation which is a resident of the United Kingdom shall be deemed to have paid the United Kingdom tax appropriate to such dividend, and

"(b) the recipient of any royalty or other amount coming within the scope of article VIII of the present convention shall be deemed to have paid any United Kingdom tax legally deducted from the royalty or other amount by the person by or through whom any payment thereof is made,

if the recipient of the dividend or royalty or other amount, as the case may be, elects to include in his gross income for the purposes of United States tax the amount of such United Kingdom income tax."

ARTICLE III

(1) This supplementary Protocol shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at London as soon as possible.

(2) This supplementary Protocol shall enter into force upon the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall thereupon have effect—

(a) In the United Kingdom:

(i) as respects income tax and surtax for any year of assessment beginning on or after the 6th April 1956;

(ii) as respects profits tax for any chargeable accounting period beginning on or after the 1st April 1956, and for the unexpired portion of any chargeable accounting period current at that date.

(b) In the United States: As respects taxable years beginning on or after the 1st day of January 1956.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this supplementary protocol and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Washington this 19th day of August 1957.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL]

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[SEAL]

HAROLD CACCIA.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this protocol amends the 1945 tax convention with the United Kingdom so as to eliminate double taxation of royalty payments on patents, copyrights, trademarks, and things of that nature.

As the convention now stands, these payments are taxed twice when they are paid by a United Kingdom licensee to an American licensor with a permanent establishment in the United Kingdom. In these cases, a United Kingdom tax is collected from the licensee, and the American tax is collected from the licensor who is not given credit for the British tax paid by the licensee.

The protocol would correct this situation by providing an exemption from British tax in cases in which the payments are not related to the business operations carried on by the licensor's permanent establishment in the United Kingdom. In cases in which the payments were not exempt from the British tax, the protocol would make the American foreign tax credit available to the licensor.

These provisions operate on a reciprocal basis.

The Senate should be aware, Mr. President, that objection has been made to this protocol by one—and only one—large American corporation which has a number of net royalty arrangements with British firms. Under these arrangements, the American corporation receives a fixed amount of royalties, after all British taxes have been paid by the licensees. The amount of the British tax, therefore, does not affect the net payment received by the American company.

The particular corporation—and the only one—to which I refer appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, and complained that it would not receive any relief under the protocol. It preferred a legislative approach under which it would receive a retroactive windfall going back to 1950. On the other hand, it made no showing that it would suffer disadvantage under the protocol.

The Foreign Relations Committee was not persuaded by that single objection; but I thought that in fairness I should call it to the attention of the Senate. At the same time, I point out that the protocol is strongly supported by the National Foreign Trade Council and, of course, by the Treasury and the Department of State.

I urge the Senate to add its approval.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the protocol between the United States and

Great Britain is under debate, I wish to take only a few moments to comment on another matter.

I suppose it is true that I have been as critical, if not more critical, of many phases of American foreign policy under this administration as has any other Member of the Senate. I have been particularly critical of American foreign policy in regard to the Middle East; and I still am critical of American foreign policy, as of the past, in the Middle East.

But, Mr. President, in my service in the Senate whenever one with whom I disagree on some matters follows, in respect to another matter, a course of action with which I agree, I always try to be fair and to say so.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am proud to be an American, in light of the speech the President of the United States made this morning before the General Assembly of the United Nations. In that speech, I think the President enunciated a program of action which, if we succeed in implementing it, will stand to the everlasting credit of our foreign policy.

I am fully aware of the fact, Mr. President, that some of the President's proposals were couched in very general and, in connection with his reference to Jordan, in somewhat ambiguous terms. Yet, when we read the speech and examine it from its four corners, and then compare it with the speech subsequently delivered by the Russian representative, I believe there is no question or doubt that the goals of America are peaceful, whereas the goals of the Russians obviously are motivated by a desire to stir up international trouble.

Mr. President, the broad outlines of the President's program, as set forth in his speech in the United Nations General Assembly this morning were laid down by him, I believe, in a very able manner. Now it becomes the duty of this administration to do everything possible to implement that program. In the past President Eisenhower has made some very fine speeches setting forth some very sound objectives but unfortunately he has failed to carry through on his words. Even a President should be judged by the maxim—actions speak louder than words. I pray and trust that this time the President will devote and dedicate himself to implementing the program he outlined in his speech.

Furthermore, it also becomes the duty of the United Nations, in connection with its search for peace, to give the support necessary for United Nations implementation of the parts of the President's proposals which require United Nations action. For instance, the recommendation of the President with regard to United Nations forces, and the recommendation of the President with regard to the United Nations as a whole playing a greater part in maintaining peace in the United Nations to support a program for United Nations forces and United Nations guarantees of territorial integrity.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15865

Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After talking to the chairman of the subcommittee, I have been led to believe that favorable action will be taken on that measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from California that if the committee is able to take action—and I know it will if it can—he will have the cooperation of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, particularly the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], on any matter affecting California; and I have always found California Senators to be irresistible. [Laughter.]

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report, which is signed by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Friday, Aug. 8, 1958, p. 15369, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the statement by the managers on the part of the House.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1798) to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recom-

mended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment was designed to assure the availability of water transportation to communities within the protected inland waters of southeastern Alaska, with particular regard to the smaller outports having no or inadequate regular common-carrier service. Under the House amendment small vessels owned or chartered by cooperative associations would not be deemed carrying "freight for hire" within the meaning of the inspection laws, if their operations were limited to the ports of southeastern Alaska generally, including operations to and from those ports having more or less frequent common-carrier service.

Section 2 of the House amendment further restricts the waiver of the inspection laws only to vessels constructed prior to the enactment of the act and presently in operation in Alaskan waters. Section 2 further provides that the act cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1962. These limitations were intended as inducement to the present operators to replace their vessels in the not too distant future with new vessels suitable for the trade, and complying with the inspection laws.

The conference substitute would further amend section 2 of the House amendment by removing the requirement that the vessels affected be only those "now in operation in Alaskan waters" and the provision that the act cease to be effective on and after June 30, 1962. In lieu of the stricken language the conference substitute adds a proviso that on and after March 15, 1960, the exemption from the inspection laws shall apply only to vessels engaged in transportation to and from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska not receiving annual weekly transportation service from any part of the United States by an established common carrier by water. It is further provided, however, that this limitation is not applicable to the transportation of cargo of a character not accepted for transportation by any such common carrier.

The conferees recognize the essentiality of assuring continued availability of water transportation to the southeastern Alaskan communities not adequately served by common carriers by water or other forms of transportation. Therefore, it is the intent of the conferees of the House and the Senate that the situation be again carefully reviewed prior to March 15, 1960, in order to ascertain whether or not further legislative action may be needed, to assure essential service to and from such communities on a reasonable basis.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
ED A. GARMATZ,
FRANK BOYKIN,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as 8-7-58-F, which I offer in behalf of myself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. LANGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HENNING, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JAVITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE XIII—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1958

Short Title

Sec. 1301. This title may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1958."

Definitions

Sec. 1302. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "school facilities", except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes), for education which is provided as elementary or secondary education, in the applicable State, at public expense and under public supervision and direction. Such term does not include athletic stadiums, or other structures or facilities, intended primarily for event, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or off-site improvement, or structures or facilities designed to be used exclusively for special activities, such as single-purpose auditoriums and gymnasiums.

(2) The terms "constructing" and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

Findings and declaration of purpose

Sec. 1303. The Congress finds that there is an appalling national shortage of public elementary and secondary school facilities despite strenuous efforts of States and local communities, because their limited financial resources simply are not adequate to support necessary construction programs to eliminate such shortages. In many cases, local communities are hampered in their efforts to solve their problems by restrictive debt and tax limits, by the uneven distribution of taxable real estate among school districts, by their inability to borrow necessary funds at reasonable rates of interest, or similar reasons.

The Congress, while recognizing that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities is primarily that of the several States and their communities, finds that the national interest in our public school system requires that the Federal Government assist the States, consistent with their respective responsibilities, in meeting school construction needs. The Congress recognizes that the solution of this problem will require a long-range Federal assistance school construction program. However, in view of the emergency created by the appalling shortage of classrooms, an immediate Federal school construction program is necessary. It is the purpose of this title to provide such emergency assistance to the States, so that this critical problem of inadequate school facilities may be attacked immediately in the light of current and anticipated school shortages, by authorizing grants to State educational agencies.

Authorization of appropriations

Sec. 1304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and the next succeeding fiscal year, such amounts, not to exceed \$1 billion in either fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this title.

Allotments to States

Sec. 1305. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 1304, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States.

State plans

Sec. 1306. (a) Any State which desires to accept the benefits of this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which shall—

(1) provide that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(2) set forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely for school facilities construction projects approved by the State educational agency;

(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title;

(4) provide for the establishment of standards on a State level for planning and constructing school facilities; and

(5) provide that the State educational agency will make reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as is reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title.

(b) Any State plan or modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) shall be approved by the Commissioner but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State educational agency involved reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

no further reservations shall be made under section 1307 (b) for projects in the State, and there shall be no further payments for any project directly affected by such failure, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended. The Commissioner, after notice as provided in this subsection to any State may suspend further reservations of funds under section 1307 (b) for projects pending the making of findings under this subsection.

Payments to States

Sec. 1307. (a) Payments under this title shall be made only to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 1306 and which furnish statements to the Commissioner in accordance with this section. Every statement shall set forth one or more projects approved by the State educational agency under the plan, the estimated cost of each such project, and the amount which the State educational agency desires to be paid out of the State's allotment for each project.

(b) Except as provided in section 1308, the Commissioner shall issue, to each State educational agency furnishing a statement in accordance with subsection (a), a commitment reserving, out of the State's allotment, for each project included in the statement, the amount requested by the State educational agency for that project. Upon request of the State educational agency and receipt of an amended statement from such agency, the Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved, but only to the extent that the change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title. Such payments to the State educational agency shall be made by the Commissioner through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury, upon certification by the State educational

agency that the financing of the remainder of the cost of construction of the project has been arranged. Funds so paid shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of constructing the project for which the amount was reserved and for no other purpose.

(c) If any project for which one or more payments have been made under this section is abandoned, or is not completed within a reasonable period determined under regulations of the Commissioner, the State to which such payments were made shall repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amount as may be reasonable under the circumstances (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the Federal district court for the district in which such project is located).

Matching by States

Sec. 1308. The Commissioner may issue or modify a commitment under section 1307 only if the amount to be reserved under the commitment, plus any amounts paid or to be paid under other commitments previously issued under this title to the same State educational agency, does not exceed one-half of the sum of (1) the cost of constructing the project in question and (2) the total cost of constructing the projects for which such other commitments have been issued, and if the State educational agency certifies that the remainder of the cost of constructing the project in question will be paid out of funds other than funds paid by the Commissioner under Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. Until actual construction costs are available, cost determinations under this section shall be made on the basis of estimates furnished under section 1307 (a) and revised estimates furnished in compliance with section 1306 (a) (5).

Judicial review

Sec. 1309. (a) Any State dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action under section 1306, may appeal to the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located. Summons and notice of appeal may be served any place in the United States and the Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court a transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The court shall have jurisdiction either to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States, as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

Amend the table of contents by inserting at the end thereof the following:

Title XIII—School Construction Assistance Act of 1958

Sec. 1301. Short title.

Sec. 1302. Definitions.

Sec. 1303. Findings and declaration of purpose.

Sec. 1304. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 1305. Allotments to States.

Sec. 1306. State plans.

Sec. 1307. Payments to States.

Sec. 1308. Matching by States.

Sec. 1309. Judicial review.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective upon the adoption of this agreement, during the further consideration of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, with the exception of the school construction amendment, 8-7-58-F, hereinafter referred to, proposed by Senator McNAMARA, on behalf of himself and other Senators, debate upon any amendment, motion, or appeal shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided, and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That upon the school construction amendment, debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, as in the case of any other amendment: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received. For purposes of this agreement, the said school construction amendment, 8-7-58-F, shall be considered germane.

Ordered further, That after the third reading of S. 4237, it shall be in order for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13247, the companion House bill; that the said bill shall be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 4237, as amended; that the said amendment to H. R. 13247 shall be deemed to be engrossed, and the bill, as amended, to be read the third time.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of said House bill, as amended, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of said bill, allot additional time to any Senator, during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Michigan yield to himself?

Mr. McNAMARA. Thirty minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with many of my colleagues who have had words of praise for the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not only for the outstanding work he has done, in the present circumstances, dealing with aid to education in the form of a scholarship bill, but also for his many years of devotion to the educational system of the United States.

The Federal scholarship bill now before the Senate is an important measure.

It is important in that it represents a relatively broad Federal aid program instead of one limited by specific requirements as are the GI bill and impacted area programs.

Moreover, the scholarship bill is a much-needed recognition of the importance of scientific education in today's world to meet the needs of tomorrow.

We can be thankful for the awakening from our slumber brought about by the first sputnik.

However, I regret to say that, fine as the scholarship bill is, it meets only about 5 percent of our national education problem.

I do not mean to imply that the bill before us is insignificant. In my opinion it is a very fine bill as far as it goes.

While it is another acknowledgment of the right and the duty of the Federal Government to offer direct financial assistance in the field of education, the measure attacks the problem at a level, comparatively speaking, where the least assistance is required.

It is, to a large extent, like constructing a building by starting with the top floor.

The place to start is at the foundation. This is as true in the field of education as it is in the construction industry.

The proper training of scientists, engineers or members of any other profession begins long before the college level.

That is so obvious that it should not even have to be stated. Yet, that very basic principle is constantly overlooked or purposely ignored when we discuss education assistance.

The years a child spends in primary and secondary schools are the formative years.

These are the years when he builds his study habits.

These are the years when he builds his basic education foundation for his future career as a useful member of society, whether or not he completes a formal college level education.

How can we help that student gain these vital study habits and build this foundation if the proper primary and secondary school environment is not provided.

This is where we must start. This is where America's future begins.

There are two basic problems at the primary and secondary levels of education.

One concerns the critical shortage of teachers and the low level of teachers' salaries.

Today thousands of properly trained teachers are desperately needed to relieve a critical shortage.

The shortage of teachers is not immediately apparent because school districts meet it with emergency measures, such as by recruiting temporary, and too often poorly trained teachers, increasing the class size or by having pupils attend schools half days.

None of these measures is in keeping with America's reputation for greatness, or is proper for American education.

Baling wire and chewing gum might serve in an emergency to get a car to the garage for permanent repairs.

But the damage done a student during these formative school years by ill-trained teachers, crowded rooms or half-day sessions is permanent damage that cannot be repaired. It will follow that individual to his grave.

One reason there is a shortage, of course, is the low level of teachers' salaries.

The National Education Association estimates that the average salary for teachers is only \$4,650 a year, scarcely above the average manufacturing wage, despite the teachers' necessary educational requirements.

The teachers represent an important part of our basic education problem, but it is to another part of the problem that I wish to address my main attention.

That is the continuing and growing shortage of classrooms at the primary and secondary school level.

Let me say here that meeting the classroom shortage problem through Federal assistance to the States can help attack the teacher problem.

Federal financial assistance to the States for school construction will, in turn, free some local money that could then be used to improve teachers' salaries.

The classroom shortage has been well documented by responsible authorities. The most conservative estimate of the shortage nationwide is 140,000 classrooms.

Unfortunately, this is not a shortage that we can expect to see reduced annually as the States build more classrooms. If so, there might be some excuse for inaction.

From all indications this is a continuing shortage that will become worse faster than it can be reduced.

It includes classrooms needed to keep up with America's increasing population, as well as those needed to replace the firetraps and antiquated structures.

The population figures, alone, show that we must increase the total number of classrooms, not to speak of enough classrooms to reduce class sizes and to replace obsolete structures.

When school resumes next month, nearly 35 million students will be in attendance in the primary and secondary schools.

This compares with 33½ million during the 1957-58 school year, which was an increase of 3.8 percent over the previous year.

Since 1948 the increase in pupil enrollment has been a staggering 35.9 percent.

By 1965 the experts expect more than 40 million pupils enrolled.

We have a clear choice. We can permit today's and tomorrow's students to continue receiving a secondary education because of overcrowded or antiquated facilities.

Or we do something about it. The amendment my colleagues and I offer today proposes to do something about it.

The amendment does not pretend to be a panacea for the Nation's present and future education problems. It does not pretend to solve the overall classroom shortage.

However, adoption of this amendment would provide us with an emergency program that will reduce the shortage significantly.

We present no startling new program of Federal aid.

Indeed, the principle of Federal aid in the education field is as old as our Republic. What is required now is solid implementation of this long-established principle.

I will not attempt, in these brief remarks, to trace the history of Federal education assistance in great detail, but a few highlights might be mentioned.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1785 specifically provided that "There shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township."

A similar ordinance of 1787 stated: Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

These ordinances led to the Land-Grant Act of 1862 which brought about the establishment of the land-grant colleges, such as Michigan State University and others.

Let us turn now to more modern times. In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, had this to say:

From the Revolution to the Civil War, the Federal Government encouraged and financially aided education in the States. It endowed higher and common schools with lands, and made grants of surplus tax moneys; but it did not attempt to regulate the purposes, define the programs, supervise the teachings, or otherwise control education in the States.

There is no lack of evidence that there is a firmly established record of the Federal Government's right and responsibility to take an active interest in the promotion of education.

We can turn, for instance, to the famous GI bill, under which many thousands of our young citizens went to college under Federal grants.

Or the laws which provide construction and operating funds to areas which have an influx of federally connected children.

These are examples of how the Congress and the Federal Government have acted to provide assistance in specific circumstances.

What we need now is a broad program, a program that will really get at the heart of the education crisis. Such a program, to my mind, must start with Federal aid to the States for school construction.

Over the years congressional committees have held scores of hearings on education bills, producing volume after volume of testimony.

They all boil down to about the same conclusions: Federal assistance to the States for education purposes should be stepped up, and a good place to start is in classroom construction.

Congress is not the only place where this decision has been reached.

The same conclusions have been developed from the local school boards all the way up to the White House.

15868

They are echoed by local parents' groups and national organizations.

Recently, the Detroit Council of Parent-Teachers Associations adopted a resolution calling on Congress to pass an urgently needed school-construction bill.

The American Parents Committee told us last December:

Between 56,000 and 65,000 new classrooms will be needed each year to take care of increased enrollments and replacement of obsolete and hazardous buildings. The Federal Government collects three-fourths of the country's tax money; it should share in meeting the expense of this emergency.

The APC deplors the defeat of the Federal aid for school construction bill in 1957 and believes that the next session of Congress must in some way help States to provide the classrooms needed for the education of the Nation's children.

This is the next session of Congress, and it is almost over.

This is our one chance this year, and our first chance in the Senate in many years, to act on a meaningful education program.

Mr. President, in his address this morning, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] quoted from a speech he delivered some 10 years ago to back up his arguments for the pending scholarship-loan bill.

I wonder if he would mind if I quoted from a speech he made less than 4 years ago to back up my arguments for my school construction amendment.

On January 6, 1955, in introducing a school construction bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama told of the tremendous shortage of classrooms. He said:

The picture will grow blacker every year as the birthrate continues at record heights, as costs grow, and as teachers' salaries remain below adequate levels. New schools are needed throughout the Nation, both to meet the rising school population and to replace outworn or unsafe buildings.

People throughout America are demanding, rightfully, that Congress act to remedy these intolerable conditions. They are concerned not only with the well-being of the children themselves, but with the danger that our superiority in the struggle against Communist imperialism may be threatened by failure to maintain American brainpower to overbalance the Soviet bloc's massive manpower.

As of today, the Russians are outstripping us in engineering graduates, in scientific specialists, in the production of those skills essential to national strength and security. We dare not fall behind. We dare not neglect our elementary and secondary schools, where training of physicists, mathematicians, engineers, and other highly skilled and educated personnel must begin. We dare not neglect our institutions of higher learning. (From a statement by Senator HILL on the growing shortage of classrooms; delivered on January 6, 1955, when introducing S. 5, to provide \$500 million a year for school construction.)

Mr. President, I submit that the remarks made on that occasion by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, are even more pertinent today than they were when they were made in 1955 by this great American.

Mr. President, a moment ago I mentioned that the plea for Federal aid for

school construction has gone as high as the White House. I wish I could say that the President has been a firm and consistent fighter for a Federal aid construction bill; but I am afraid I cannot.

It was not until 1955, more than 2 years after he became President, that he asked Congress to adopt an education program that included Federal aid for school construction.

He took the same approach in his 1956 message. And in 1957, he said:

Of all the problems, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country * * * I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

Yet, in 1958 the President dropped completely his support of a solution to this pressing problem of the classroom shortage.

I shall not dwell here on this tragic lack of conviction. I look upon it more in sadness than in anger.

But in referring to the White House, I should like to call attention to the findings of the White House Conference on Education, which took place late in 1955.

On the subject of Federal aid to schools, the report of the White House conference had this to say:

A substantial majority felt that some States do not have sufficient financial resources to take care of the essential needs of the schools.

The participants approved by a ratio of 2 to 1 the proposition that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education. Of those favoring such increase, the overwhelming majority approved an increase in Federal funds for school-building construction.

The report ended with the following warning about financing education in the future:

The problem of financing our schools * * * is not lack of capacity to support education adequately. The problem is national determination to apply enough of our available resources to the job.

The people of America need urgently to re-examine the allocation of tax funds at all levels of Government. The destiny of our children and our free society demands that we use more of our wealth for education.

The recent Rockefeller Brothers Fund Report on Education notes that "all of the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing."

This thorough report objectively discusses the subject of Federal aid to the States for education, and it fails to find the fire-breathing monster called control lurking in the background.

It does lay down one general ground rule:

Federal funds should be used only to balance the serious gaps in the total national educational system—and should be given in such a manner as to encourage State and local governments to use their own resources—and where necessary to remove the barriers to use of their own resources.

Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with that ground rule, and I am sure my colleagues who support Federal aid do also.

We do not want the Federal Government to supplant State and local efforts in education. We do not desire to de-

prive the people of the school district and the State of their grave responsibilities.

We do wish to aid them in fulfilling these responsibilities.

Returning to the Rockefeller Report on Education, Mr. President, it notes that a popular form of Federal support for education is the scholarship program.

It says the scholarships involve a minimum hazard of Federal interference.

Then the report goes on to say:

Another much discussed form of Federal aid which involves a minimum of hazard to local initiative is funds for building construction.

In the years immediately ahead, great expansion of the physical plant will be required at every level of the educational system.

To the extent that the Federal Government can assist in this problem either through loans or outright grants, it will be engaging in one of the most helpful and least hazardous forms of support to education.

As I said earlier, many organizations have expressed themselves as firmly in favor of Federal aid to education.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial list of such national organizations be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

- American Association of School Administrators.
- American Association of University Professors.
- American Association of University Women.
- AFL-CIO.
- American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO).
- American Home Economics Association.
- American Institute of Architects.
- American Library Association.
- American Parents Committee.
- American Veterans Committee.
- American Veterans of World War II and Korea.
- American Vocational Association.
- Americans for Democratic Action.
- Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen (Ind.)
- Cooperative League of the USA.
- Council of Chief State School Officers.
- International Association for Childhood Education.
- Jewish War Veterans.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
- National Association of Social Workers.
- National Child Labor Committee.
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
- National Consumers League.
- National Council of Jewish Women.
- National Education Association.
- National Farmers' Union.
- National Jewish Welfare Board.
- National School Boards Association.
- Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen (Ind.).
- Railway Labor Executives' Association.
- Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
- United Mine Workers (Ind.).

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, another list of organizations opposing Federal assistance probably will be entered in the Record at some point in the debate. It undoubtedly will be headed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Manufacturers

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15869

Association, two organizations which steadfastly refuse to recognize the advent of the 20th century.

Their main argument is the scare tactic that Federal aid means Federal control. This unsupported argument has been knocked down so many times that one would think these organizations would be embarrassed to try it again. Yet they persist in presenting this strawman for a further mauling. It is not a new argument, but it is one the proponents have yet to sustain.

President Hoover's 1931 National Advisory Committee on Education dealt with it by stating:

The widely current notion that control of education follows any and all types of financial grants is not verified by experience.

That statement has been repeated in substantially the same form over all the years. We have recognized the existence of the fear these organizations have generated, however.

Section 102 of the scholarship bill before us states:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution.

This prohibition would apply equally to the school construction amendment which we are offering.

When the argument about Federal control falls on deaf ears, which it is increasingly, the opponents of Federal assistance cite the cost. They suggest that such a program will bankrupt, or nearly so, the Nation. Such an argument is absurd on the face of it. It is simply an excuse to undermine the Federal Government's responsibility to the States.

The school-construction program which we propose in this amendment would cost \$1 billion a year for each of 2 years. One billion dollars is a lot of money, and I have not become so mesmerized by the billions we deal with in this Congress that I fail to recognize that. However, let me point this out: Our annual budget for the fiscal year is about \$80 billion. Of this, about \$40 billion is for the national defense.

I will not argue that no one would notice another billion or so for school construction tucked into this gigantic budget, although that would not be a bad argument. Instead, I will argue that we should add this billion for school construction to the defense appropriations, because education is inescapably a part of our national defense.

In fact, I firmly believe that the proper education of our young people is

more important to our country than the biggest Army, Navy, or Air Force in the world. Education is defense, any way we look at it. If we can afford \$40 billion for defense, we certainly can afford the 41st billion for the same purpose. In fact, I do not see how we can afford not to spend it if our children and our hopes for their future and the country's future means anything to us.

I shall turn now to an outline of the specific amendment which we are offering. As I stated, it would provide \$1 billion a year for 2 years, to assist the States in school construction. The Federal funds would be made available to the States on the basis of their school-age population. The States would match the Federal contribution accepted under the program. During the 2-year program envisioned by the amendment, it is estimated that more than 105,000 classrooms could be built, significantly reducing the shortage.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the estimated allocations to each State, together with the number of estimated classrooms that could be constructed under my amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated annual allocation to States under 2-year, \$2 billion school program

State or Territory	School-age children, 5 to 17 years, as of 1954 ¹	Annual allotment based on \$27.09 per child	Potential classrooms provided for, on a 50-50 matching basis ² per year	State or Territory	School-age children, 5 to 17 years, as of 1954 ¹	Annual allotment based on \$27.09 per child	Potential classrooms provided for, on a 50-50 matching basis ² per year
Total	36,919,000	\$1,000,000,000	52,632	New Jersey	1,045,000	\$28,330,910	1,491
Alabama	827,000	22,399,295	1,179	New Mexico	214,000	5,796,190	305
Arizona	234,000	6,337,590	333	Now York	3,024,000	81,905,040	4,311
Arkansas	490,000	13,271,650	689	North Carolina	1,123,000	30,416,455	1,601
California	2,540,000	68,795,900	3,621	North Dakota	159,000	4,306,515	227
Colorado	333,000	9,019,305	476	Ohio	1,866,000	50,540,610	2,630
Connecticut	441,000	11,944,485	623	Oklahoma	527,000	14,273,745	751
Delaware	77,000	2,085,545	109	Oregon	359,000	9,723,515	512
Florida	703,000	19,040,755	1,002	Pennsylvania	2,315,000	62,691,775	3,299
Georgia	944,000	25,568,240	1,345	Rhode Island	164,000	4,441,940	234
Idaho	156,000	4,225,260	222	South Carolina	646,000	17,496,910	921
Illinois	1,867,000	50,567,695	2,681	South Dakota	159,000	4,306,515	227
Indiana	943,000	25,541,155	1,344	Tennessee	846,000	22,913,910	1,206
Iowa	592,000	16,034,320	844	Texas	2,027,000	54,901,295	2,839
Kansas	438,000	11,863,230	624	Utah	200,000	5,417,000	285
Kentucky	767,000	20,774,195	1,093	Vermont	89,000	2,410,565	127
Louisiana	746,000	20,205,410	1,063	Washington	849,000	22,995,165	1,210
Maine	207,000	5,606,595	295	West Virginia	553,000	14,978,005	788
Maryland	572,000	15,492,620	815	Wisconsin	530,000	14,355,050	755
Massachusetts	975,000	25,907,875	1,364	Wyoming	806,000	21,830,510	1,149
Michigan	1,573,000	42,604,705	2,242	Alaska	72,000	1,950,120	103
Minnesota	710,000	19,230,350	1,012	District of Columbia	23,000	622,955	33
Mississippi	600,000	16,251,000	855	Guam	148,000	4,008,580	211
Missouri	846,000	22,913,910	1,259	Hawaii	11,000	297,935	16
Montana	147,000	3,981,495	209	Puerto Rico	130,000	3,521,050	185
Nebraska	297,000	8,044,245	423	Virgin Islands	718,000	19,447,030	1,023
Nevada	43,000	1,164,655	61		8,000	216,680	11
New Hampshire	118,000	3,196,030	168				

¹ Figures for Alaska, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as of April 1, 1950. Later figures not available.

² On the basis of an average cost of \$38,000 per classroom. Figure would vary slightly depending on regions.
³ Items do not total, due to rounding of figures.

Mr. McNAMARA. The amendment which we are offering specifically provides that full control of the funds would be handled by the States through their educational agencies. While the overall program would be administered by the Commissioner of Education, his influence over how the funds are spent would be at an absolute minimum. And, as I stated earlier, the prohibition against Federal interference in the State educational sys-

tems, as spelled out in S. 4237, would apply equally to my amendment.

In closing I should like to repeat that I think the scholarship bill is a thoughtfully worked out program to assist in the higher levels of education. I, of course, support this legislation. However, I think I speak for all the cosponsors of this amendment when I say that it falls far short of what we might desire in this critical area. Our amendment is,

essentially, an emergency program, one designed to help meet a critical and immediate problem.

I urge most sincerely that it be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to add only a few words. I think the phrase "survival of the fittest" originated about the turn of the century with some English statesman, but it was repeated approximately in 1913 by a great Sunday school teacher

15870

in New York, a man named John D. Rockefeller. He made the phrase "survival of the fittest" more well known when he used it in a Sunday school class to indicate there was nothing immoral about the operation of big business in this country, that it was a question of survival of the fittest. I think we should have this phrase in mind today when we talk about education, for education really is a contest of survival of the fittest, a struggle for the minds of men in the world in which we live. I am sure we are going to see to it that our children, since they must compete with the rest of the world, are the fittest.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to thank my colleagues who joined with me in sponsoring the school construction amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added to the list of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend and cosponsor of the amendment, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan for the leadership he has shown in this matter. The Senator has fought for this measure throughout the years ever since he came to the United States Senate. I had the pleasure of serving with the Senator from Michigan for a period of time in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I know how devoted he is to the cause. He deserves the thanks of all friends of education in this country for his work.

I noticed under the terms of the proposed legislation that with the \$2 billion of Federal money in 2 years, plus the \$2 billion of State and local money for construction, there would be a total of approximately \$4 billion.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has said that amount of money would build at least 105,000 classrooms.

Mr. McNAMARA. According to the most recent estimates, that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the architects will be sufficiently simple and yet adequate in their planning so that with that amount of money it will be possible to build at least 120,000 classrooms. I think there is frequently a tendency for architects to be too lavish in their plans. Even on the basis of 105,000 classrooms, since between 30 and 35 students can use a classroom, the result would be classroom space for a total of from 3.1 million to 3.6 million students, who would be thereby given adequate facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois it was a pleasure for me to work with him on the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, which wrestles with educational programs.

The recent figures, which are generally accepted by educators, show that the classroom cost is \$38,000. That is the cost for a single classroom, and my estimate of the number of classrooms that can be built under my amendment is based on that figure.

The Senator indicates there are too many instances when there is too much plush or too much gingerbread, or whatever one may desire to call it, put into the classrooms. I think there is less and less of that every year. Classrooms are now becoming functional to such a degree that in some communities where schools are being built the residents accuse the members of the board of education of not being good neighbors because of the type of school buildings which are being constructed in residential areas.

It is possible to go overboard on that item. I do not think we ought to condemn the architects too much, because if we push them too far we will have children attending schools in factory-type buildings. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would be the last one to be associated with that kind of program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to have this word of reassurance from the Senator from Michigan. If and when the bill is passed I hope the architects will take notice, because I think the costs of hospital construction have been skyrocketed excessively, and I have noticed a similar tendency in some parts of the United States with respect to school construction.

Is it not true that there are now about 4 million students who are either on part time or are going to school in grossly defective school buildings?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. The figures for the Nation as a whole are constantly increasing. That situation is really alarming.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The emergency program which the Senator from Michigan is advocating would really help us make up for the arrearage in school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would not even completely cover that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. McNAMARA. It would go a long way toward meeting the deficiency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The arrears in school construction accumulated, did they not, because of the fact that during the depression the localities did not have money with which to construct school buildings, and thereafter came the great war, when other needs were urgent and had priority over school construction?

Mr. McNAMARA. They were not only urgent, but proper, I would say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. We all recognize we could not use materials for the building of schools which were needed for the war effort. First we had to win the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Federal Government became a part of the problem at that point, if there, was any question

about it being partly responsible prior to that time, and I do not think there was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, from 1930 to about 1946 there was very little school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. It was prohibited largely because of the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, the school plant of the country became more and more obsolete.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was some increase in school enrollment in that time.

Mr. McNAMARA. There was quite a rapid increase in the latter part of the period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Beginning in about 1940 or 1941, the birthrate took a big jump.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The birthrate has continued to increase, by and large, since then.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the number of children who go to schools has swollen into a regular torrent. Is that not true?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator describes it very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even if we were keeping up now with the current rate of inflow, which would be a terrific effort, we would still have the arrearage to make good.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that schoolchildren are now going to school for a greater number of years than they used to? Years ago high-school education was for the minority. Now, high-school education is for the vast majority. Therefore, there is an increasing need for the construction of high-school buildings. Is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is certainly correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true there would be some indirect benefit to education aside from school construction, because in certain localities if the Federal Government met half of the cost of construction some funds would be released for teachers' salaries, for books, and for other things?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct. The Senator stresses the point I mentioned in my speech.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So it is a blood transfusion into an overtaxed and financially starved educational system.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Michigan for his ability, his energy, and the way he has tackled the whole problem.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon next, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15871

yielding to me. I point out that the leadership which the Senator from Michigan has demonstrated in the field of education bears out what was said to me 4 years ago by our Oregon chancellor of education, Dr. John R. Richards, who is seated in the gallery today. When I first came to the Senate in January 1955, when, I believe, the Senator from Michigan also took the oath of office, Chancellor Richards told me that one of the genuine leaders in the field of education was Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA. I believe Chancellor Richards and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, then Mr. McNamara, were associated at Wayne University and in other educational enterprises in the great city of Detroit.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the fact that my good friend Dr. Richards is in the gallery. I want to see him before he leaves Washington.

Mr. NEUBERGER. He knew that the speech of the Senator from Michigan would bear out the indications of leadership shown by the Senator from Michigan in the many enterprises in which they worked together in the State of Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan has performed a service to the whole country, particularly future generations of Americans, by making it possible for the Senate to vote on the issue of whether or not we shall do something, not only for higher education, which—as the Senator has stressed—is very important, but also for those entering the elementary schools and high schools of the Nation.

After all, a structure is only as sound as its foundation. The foundation of our great colleges and universities rests in the kindergartens, the grade schools, and the high schools of America.

I think it is significant that the New York Times of yesterday states editorially that the measure which came to us from the House—does not say anything about Federal aid for school construction, a program that the administration dropped this year; but one that must and will be revived in the new Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, August 12, 1958, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO THE SCHOOLS

Having waited almost to the last minute for the House to act, the Senate will now doubtless put through its own education bill very speedily. We hope it will be a better bill than the one passed 4 days ago by the House.

Inadequate though it is, especially in view of the fact that all scholarship funds were eliminated, the House bill is still much better than nothing. If the Senate insists on some scholarship money, and makes other improvements, a quite acceptable measure can come out of conference committee and be adopted by both Houses before the onrushing adjournment. In that case the 85th Congress will have made a modest but definite contribution to relieving the educational crisis that has been afflicting our country for years—long before sputnik was ever heard of.

Although bereft of scholarship funds as it passed the House, the measure does provide some \$900 million in various forms of educational aid over a 4-year period. One of the ways it does so is through grants to stimulate testing and guidance programs. Another is through the useful device of long-term, low-interest loans to needy students. This provision for Federal assistance may stimulate a new interest in locally operated nonprofit guidance and scholarship loan programs, such as the successful one that has existed in Dallas for over a decade. The House bill also provides for graduate fellowships, for grants to the States to strengthen mathematics, science and language teaching in the schools, and for research and experimentation in the use of mass media for educational purposes. In all these areas, the bill may furnish a stimulus to State and local action as well.

The pending measure does not say anything about Federal aid for school construction, a program that the administration dropped this year; but one that must and will be revived in the new Congress.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Michigan has moved ahead of the New York Times chronologically, and he has revived the subject in this session of Congress, rather than waiting for the next session.

The Senator from Michigan pointed out in his very able address that Federal aid to schools is certainly justified from the standpoint of finance. I think one of his best expressions was:

If we can afford \$40 billion for defense, we certainly can afford the \$1st billion for the same purpose.

He had already pointed out in his brilliant speech that education is defense.

Is it not true that almost every forward step in the field of education in this country has been resisted and denounced? When the Morrill Act was passed in 1862, in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, by which act land grants were to be used by the Federal Government to encourage land-grant colleges, the denunciation of that act was far more severe than the criticism today with relation to Federal aid in school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true. The arguments were almost the same as those used today. If we go back to the birth of the public-school system, we would find similar resistance all through our history.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that the local property tax in many areas has broken down as an adequate means of supporting necessary school construction and necessary educational operations?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct, but despite that, we are insisting, in the amendment we propose, that the States provide 50 percent of the funds, which will be matched with Federal funds. We know that it is a tremendous load to put on the States, but that is as far as we could hope to go at this time in our history.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I recognize that the Senator from Michigan regards this measure as an introductory measure, to write into legislation the principle that the Federal Government has a responsibility at the very beginning of the educational process.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that

every child is a citizen, not only of Michigan, Oregon, Illinois, or South Carolina, but essentially of the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is certainly so; and it is the responsibility of every citizen to educate every child, regardless of the State in which he may go to school.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Federal Government can levy on the child's life if there is an emergency, and send him to the far corners of the world to help defend the United States, as has been done several times during our lifetime.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is true; and a certain amount of education is required in order for a person to be eligible to serve his country. Certainly it is a national problem, as the Senator says.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has not the Federal Government some genuine obligation to see to it that a child, while growing up and maturing, has an education adequate to enable him to encounter the storms and vicissitudes of life?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time which the Senator from Michigan allotted himself has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram in support of Federal aid to education generally, which I have received from a number of outstanding educational leaders in the State of Oregon, associated with the Oregon Education Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, July 2, 1958.

Hon. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The voters of several communities in Oregon recently rejected proposed school budgets, thereby jeopardizing the established school program of the respective communities. A cause of the defeat of these tax elections was heavy local property taxes.

This morning the 85 Oregon delegates to the NEA convention in Cleveland unanimously reaffirmed their conviction that Federal aid to education will provide the only solution to pressing State school finance problems.

We strongly urge your continued support of the Thompson school construction bill (H. R. 12085) and the Murray-Metcalf bills (S. 3311, H. R. 10763) which would appropriate Federal funds to the States for use by local school districts for construction and for supplementing the salaries of teachers in public schools. Oregon's schools need the aid proposed in these measures.

These bills adequately safeguard State and local control of education since State authorities would allocate and supervise use of these funds.

MARTHA SHULL,
Past President, National Education Association.

TOM POWERS,
President, Oregon Education Association.
CLARENCE HINES,
President, Oregon Association of School Administrators.

EWALD TURNER,
President, National Department of Classroom Teachers.

LOUIS CORRIGAN,
President, Oregon Department of Classroom Teachers.

15872

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as may be necessary to enable me to yield to the Senator from Texas, and also to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I divulge no secret when I say to the Senator from Michigan that he and I are more aware, perhaps, than any other Members of this body of the number of subjects upon which we disagree. But there is one thing as to which we have no disagreement and that is the devotion of the Senator from Michigan to the cause of education.

He has been diligent. He has been effective. A few days ago I said in this Chamber that I did not want the Senate to adjourn, and that it would not adjourn if it followed any suggestions I might make, until it had passed an effective education bill.

The committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan is an able member has been working on a bill for several months. It promptly reported the bill to this body. That bill does not go as far or as fast as many Members think it should, but I would not want the Senator to conclude the very able address he is making without affording me an opportunity to say to him, as sincerely as I know how, that in my opinion perhaps we would not have had any kind of education bill except for his constant prodding all the year long. The first letter I received from any Member of the Senate on this subject during this session was from the Senator from Michigan. In that letter he pointed out the absolute necessity for our taking prompt action in the field of education. He pointed to the great strides the Soviet Union had made. He pointed to the startling revelations which had been brought out in the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings. He not only urged that we provide a program such as has been recommended by the committee, but that we provide a much stronger program, such as he has offered in his own amendment.

While I do not agree with all his conclusions, I do bear testimony to his great interest, to his devotion, to his dedication, and to the great service he has rendered in this particular field. As I stated earlier, I believe that when the history of this generation is written we shall stand or fall by what we did, and when we did it, so far as the field of education in this country is concerned.

I believe it is later than we think. I am very proud that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and other members of the committee, without regard to partisanship on either side of the aisle, have brought to the Senate an education bill. While I may not agree with the Senator from Michigan on some of its provisions and some of its amendments, I do say that we would probably have had no bill at all except for his persistence and insistence. I pay tribute to him for it.

While I am on my feet, and with the indulgence of the Senator from Michigan, I wish to thank my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and to tell him how much I appreciate his loyalty to this cause and his cooperation in acting in behalf of the national interest whenever I have had occasion to call upon him.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to respond to the majority leader by saying that he stresses too much our disagreement. I believe we are largely in agreement on aid to education. I have heard the distinguished majority leader publicly make it an important part of his program. I know of his sincerity. I believe we have much more in common than we have in conflict when the chips are down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One of the proudest periods of my life was when I was a teacher in a small sixth grade school. There is no satisfaction which is greater than that which comes from seeing one's work in the classroom bear fruit.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the majority leader for the very kind expressions about my small contribution and feeble efforts in this field.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the majority leader for what he said a moment ago. I should like to join in the remarks made this morning by the Senator from Montana and other Senators in congratulating the majority leader for the masterly way in which he has conducted himself during the sessions of Congress. I have derived great personal happiness and pride in being able to work with him in a bipartisan way for those things which belong to us as American, not as Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from South Carolina and I serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As is true with respect to the Senator from Texas, the Senator from South Carolina and I do not always see exactly eye to eye with each other, but I recognize his interest in the problem we are considering and his devotion to the committee from which the pending bill has come to the Senate. I am glad to yield to the Senator at this time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his kindness in yielding to me. I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. Is it not true that this bill, although it purports to be a bill for the purpose of promoting the national defense, is, in actuality, a general Federal aid to education bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe the bill provides general Federal aid to education, which is certainly a part of national defense; yes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator for his frankness in admitting that it is a bill of general Federal aid to education.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe it is.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not correct to say that under the pending bill,

neither the school program nor the student loan program is limited in any way to persons undertaking a course of study considered to be critical to our national defense?

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe, as was brought out in the consideration of the bill in committee, that instruction in mathematics, science, languages, or anything else, is in the interest of the national defense. I agree with the discussions we had in the committee to that end.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the bill, a student could pursue studies in social welfare, automobile driving, flower arrangement, horse breeding, or tap dancing; is that not correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is not correct. The program will be administered by a director in the Department of Education. I am sure that any logical interpretation of the proposed legislation would preclude any such use of funds. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I promised my good friend from New York who must leave—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. I will yield myself an additional 5 minutes, so that I may yield to the Senator from New York. I understand that the Senator from South Carolina has made some reservation to speak on his own time. I hope the Senator will not take further of our time on the amendment. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] wishes to speak on it also.

Mr. THURMOND. I wanted to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator. I should like to have him point out in the bill any limitation on courses which a recipient of a scholarship or a loan would be confronted with if he were awarded such a scholarship or loan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall be glad to go into it on the Senator's own time. We are limited in time. At this point I should like to yield to the Senator from New York, who must leave by plane for Europe later this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am with the Senator from Michigan on the amendment which he has offered for school construction. I have had very profound concern about the per capita formula which is contained in his amendment. In New York it would work out very advantageously for us. I believe, however, that we could minimize the cost to the Federal Government by inserting a formula which is based more on inability of a State to supply its own needs.

I realize that whenever one tries to get a result, one must yield some points in order to get most support. Hence I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I wish to express my appreciation to him; also, the appreciation of a great number of people in my State. I express appreciation for his giving us an opportunity, by marshaling the support which he has marshaled, to support a school construction amendment.

*BEST COPY
AVAILABLE*

I had planned to take an airplane at 7 o'clock out of New York. I am now trying to arrange a somewhat later departure, so anxious am I to vote on his amendment.

Finally, I should like to say that the two things which I believe represent the clearest indices of competition between ourselves and the Soviet Union are housing and schools. It seems to me, therefore, that we are showing the whole free world this example of school construction which urgently needs—and I believe the Senator from Michigan can prove this beyond peradventure—Federal aid in order to do a really good job.

In that respect, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He has said frankly, as is the Senator's manner, that this is a Federal aid to schools bill. Is it not true, also, that in the really vital definition of the term security—the security which comes from a satisfied and educated people, the security which comes from an adequate number of teachers, and which comes from the skills which a population learns by education, such security as the Russians themselves are showing by their fantastic progress in 30-odd years, largely because of education—this is quite justifiably a national security bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly agree. I will be glad to have the Senator from New York cosponsor my amendment, which he has endorsed. I know of the problems which exist in the States to which he makes reference. Actually, the financially poor schools are not restricted to certain States or areas. It is the needy school districts that count. We have them throughout the entire United States. There are poor school districts in the rich States, because they surround an industrial area. There are commercial areas where such districts are referred to as "bedroom communities," where only residential taxes support community activities and the school district. These are truly poor school districts, whether they are located north, south, east, or west. It is a national problem. This is in defense of my formula in the bill.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 13, 1958, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- 1. An act to reconstitute certain territorial and local judges.
- 2. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system and for other purposes, and
- 3. An act to amend the Shipping Act.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

A message in executive session, The PRESIDENT OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THIRD SPECIAL EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the Record the outstanding address given by the President of the United States today at the Third Special Emergency General Assembly of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE THIRD SPECIAL EMERGENCY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, AUGUST 13, 1958.

It has been almost 8 years since I had the honor of addressing this Assembly. I then spoke of atomic power and urged that we should find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man should not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life. Since then great strides have been taken in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Tragically little has been done to eliminate the use of atomic and nuclear power for weapons purposes.

That is danger. That danger in turn gives rise to another danger—the danger that nations under aggressive leadership will seek to exploit man's horror of war by confronting the nations, particularly small nations, with an apparent choice between supine surrender, or war.

This tactic reappeared during the recent Near East crisis.

Some might call it "ballistic blackmail." In most communities it is illegal to cry "Fire" in a crowded assembly. Should it not be considered serious international misconduct to manufacture a general war scare in an effort to achieve local political aims?

Pressures such as these will never be successfully practiced against America, but they do create dangers which could affect each and every one of us. That is why I have asked for the privilege of again addressing you.

The immediate reason is two small countries—Lebanon and Jordan.

The cause is one of universal concern. The lawful and freely elected Government of Lebanon, feeling itself endangered by civil strife fomented from without, sent the United States a desperate call for instant help. We responded to that call.

On the basis of that response an effort has been made to create a war hysteria. The impression is sought to be created that if small nations are assisted in their desire to survive, that endangers the peace.

This is truly an upside-down portrayal. It is made an international crime to help a small nation maintain its independence, then to seed the possibility of conquest are unbridled. We will have nullified the promise of our Charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defense. We will have set loose forces that could generate great disasters.

The United Nations has, of course, a primary responsibility to maintain not only international peace but also security. That is an important fact. But, we must not evade a second fact, namely, that in the circumstances of the world since 1945, the United Nations has sometimes been blocked.

Respect for the liberty and freedom of all nations has always been a guiding principle of the United States. This respect has been consistently demonstrated by our unwavering adherence to the principles of the Charter, particularly in its opposition to aggression, direct or indirect. Sometimes we have made that demonstration in terms of collective measures called for by the United Nations. Sometimes we have done so pursuant to what the Charter calls the inherent right of collective self-defense.

I recall the moments of clear danger we have faced since the end of the Second World War—Iran, Greece and Turkey, the Berlin blockade, Korea, the Straits of Taiwan.

A common principle guided the position of the United States on all of these occasions. That principle was that aggression, direct or indirect, must be checked before it gathered sufficient momentum to destroy us all—aggressor and defender alike.

It was this principle that was applied once again when the urgent appeals of the Governments of Lebanon and Jordan were answered.

I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that the United States reserves, within the spirit of the Charter, the right to answer the legitimate appeal of any nation, particularly small nations.

I doubt that a single free government in all the world would willingly forego the right to ask for help if its sovereignty were imperiled.

But I must again emphasize that the United States seeks always to keep within the spirit of the Charter.

Thus, when President Truman responded in 1947 to the urgent plea of Greece, the United States stipulated that our assistance would be withdrawn whenever the United Nations felt that its action could take the place of ours.

Similarly, when the United States responded to the urgent plea of Lebanon, we went at once to the Security Council and sought United Nations assistance for Lebanon so as to permit the withdrawal of United States forces.

United Nations action would have been taken, the United States forces already withdrawn, had it not been that 2 resolutions, I proposed by the United States, the other proposed by the Government of Japan, failed to pass because of 1 negative vote—a veto.

But nothing that I have said is to be construed as indicating that I regard the status quo as sacrosanct. Change is indeed the law of life and progress. But when change reflects the will of the people, then change can and should be brought about in peaceful ways.

In this context the United States respects the right of every Arab nation of the Near East to live in freedom without domination from any source, far or near.

In the same context, we believe that the Charter of the United Nations places on all of us certain solemn obligations. Without respect for each other's sovereignty and the exercise of great care in the means by which new patterns of international life are achieved, the projection of the peaceful vision of the Charter would become a mockery.

Let me turn now specifically to the problem of Lebanon.

When the United States military assistance began moving into Lebanon, I reported to the American people that we had immediately reacted to the plea of Lebanon because the situation was such that only prompt action would suffice.

I repeat to you the solemn pledge I then made. The United States has but one purpose of

such arrangements must reflect these countries' own views.

VIII

I have tried to present to you the framework of a plan for peace in the Near East which would provide a setting of political order responsive to the rights of the people in each nation; which would avoid the dangers of a regional arms race; which would permit the peoples of the Near East to devote their energies wholeheartedly to the tasks of development and human progress in the widest sense.

It is important that the six elements of this program be viewed as a whole. They are:

1. United Nations concern for Lebanon.
2. United Nations measures to preserve peace in Jordan.
3. An end to the fomenting from without of civil strife.
4. A United Nations peace force.
5. A regional economic development plan to assist and accelerate improvement in the living standards of the people in these Arab nations.
6. Steps to avoid a new arms race spiral in the area.

To have solidity, the different elements of this plan for peace and progress should be considered and acted on together, as integral elements of a single concerted effort.

Therefore, I hope that this Assembly will seek simultaneously to set in motion measures that would create a climate of security in the Near East consonant with the principles of the United Nations Charter, and at the same time create the framework for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the Arab peoples.

IX

But the peoples of the Near East are not alone in their ambition for independence and development. We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities for modernizing their societies.

The American Government has been steadily enlarging its allocations to foreign economic development in response to these worldwide hopes. We have joined in partnership with such groupings as the Organization of American States and the Colombo plan; and we are working on methods to strengthen these regional arrangements. For example, in the case of the Organization of American States, we are consulting with our sister republics of this hemisphere to strengthen its role in economic development. And the Government of the United States has not been alone in supporting development efforts. The British Commonwealth, the countries of Western Europe, and Japan have all made significant contributions.

But in many parts of the world both geography and wise economic planning favor national rather than regional development programs. The United States will, of course, continue its firm support of such national programs. Only where the desire for a regional approach is clearly manifested and where the advantage of regional over national is evident will the United States change to regional methods.

The United States is proud of the scope and variety of its development activities throughout the world. Those who know our history will realize that this is no sudden, new policy of my Government. Ever since its birth, the United States has gladly shared its wealth with others. This it has done without thought of conquest or economic domination. After victory in two world wars and the expenditure of vast treasure there is no world map, either geographic or economic, on which anyone can find that the force of American arms or the power of the American Treasury has ab-

sorbed any foreign land or political or economic system. As we cherish our freedom, we believe in freedom for others.

X

The thing I have talked about today are real and await our grasp. Within the Near East and within this Assembly are the forces of good sense, restraint, and wisdom to make, with time and patience, a framework of political order and of peace in that region.

But we also know that all these possibilities are shadowed, all our hopes are dimmed, by the fact of the arms race in nuclear weapons—a contest which drains off our best talents and vast resources, straining the nerves of all our peoples.

As I look out on this Assembly, with so many of you representing new nations, one thought above all impresses me.

The world that is being remade on our planet is going to be a world of many mature nations. As one after another of these new nations moves through the difficult transition to modernization and learns the methods of growth, from this travail new levels of prosperity and productivity will emerge.

This world of individual nations is not going to be controlled by any one power or group of powers. This world is not going to be committed to any one ideology.

Please believe me when I say that the dream of world domination by one power or of world conformity is an impossible dream.

The nature of today's weapons, the nature of modern communications, and the widening circle of new nations make it plain that we must, in the end, be a world community of open societies.

And the concept of the open society is the ultimate key to a system of arms control we can all trust.

We must, then, seek with new vigor, new initiative, the path to a peace based on the effective control of armaments, on economic advancement and on the freedom of all peoples to be ruled by governments of their choice. Only thus can we exercise the full capacity God has given us to enrich the lives of the individual human beings who are our ultimate concern, our responsibility and our strength.

In this memorable task there lies enough work and enough reward to satisfy the energies and ambitions of all leaders, everywhere.

ENDORSEMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the reason which I have heretofore given, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative clerk may read an address prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

There being no objection, the Legislative Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the American Banker of Wednesday, August 13, has a story entitled "Citizens and Southern Becomes First Bank in United States To Invest in SBA Corporation—\$325,000 Approved."

The story refers to an announcement by the president of the Citizens & Southern National Bank of Georgia that it will invest in the organization of a small business investment company under the provisions of S. 3651.

This is a bill which just passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting the signature of the President and which, when enacted, will be known as the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

I believe this announcement by a very prominent financial institution of the south will be of general interest, indicating that able financial leaders in the State of Georgia consider this bill to be one which will be practicable and workable and of great benefit to small business generally. I am very proud of the fact that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency I had a part in the enactment of this legislation which has been advocated for many years by some of the most knowledgeable persons in this field. I hope the President will sign the bill promptly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a news article about the action of the Citizens and Southern Bank.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITIZENS AND SOUTHERN BECOMES FIRST BANK IN UNITED STATES TO INVEST IN SBA CORPORATION—\$325,000 APPROVED

SAVANNAH, GA.—An important boost to Georgia small business was announced today by Mills B. Lane, president of the Citizens and Southern National Bank. The directors, meeting here, authorized investment of \$325,000 in capital in a new Georgia corporation to be sponsored by Citizens and Southern, formed for the purpose of providing venture capital for small and expanding business.

The step was believed to be the first definite action in the Nation to be taken under the terms of the Small Investment Act of 1958, passed last Thursday by Congress, and now awaiting President Eisenhower's signature. Under the law, the Small Business Administration is authorized to match private funds invested in development corporations formed by 10 or more individuals.

The law also authorized Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. insured banks to invest an amount equal to 1 percent of their capital in such development corporations.

In addition to the \$325,000 to be invested in the new corporation by Citizens and Southern National Bank, \$115,000 more will be sought from interested individuals or corporations in Georgia, plus \$60,000 from Citizens and Southern affiliate banks in Georgia. This will bring the total private investment to \$500,000 and the total initial funds to approximately \$1 million, including the participation in the form of loans and investments from the Small Business Administration.

James F. Hollingsworth, regional SBA director in Atlanta, already has been advised of the new group's plan to form a corporation under the provision of the new bill.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

According to Mr. Lane, purposes of the development corporation will be as follows:

1. To provide a pool venture capital for small businesses which will enable them to secure bank credit.
2. To assist small business so there will be no necessity for them to seek direct Government help.
3. To provide a revolving pool of capital where expanding or new business can obtain capital and management assistance until they can travel on their own.
4. To provide a clearing house for bringing together individual investors and businesses seeking capital.
5. To highlight, emphasize, and participate in Georgia's industrial growth, both for existing and new business within the State and in those coming from outside.

The importance to Georgia of small business is shown, Mr. Lane said, by the fact that of the 6,000 businesses in Atlanta, only 800 employ more than 100. One result of the development corporation will be that profit opportunities may be realized which have been missed in the past for lack of venture capital.

In effect, the corporation will serve not only to provide capital for plant expansion, etc., but also will serve to spread the risk of such loans, Mr. Lane explained, that the activities of the development corporation will tend to expand rather than curtail the operations of Citizens and Southern's own small-business loan department.

Started in Atlanta in 1945, separate departments have been in operation for 2½ years in all of the 10 Georgia cities served by Citizens and Southern. Since 1945, Citizens and Southern has made nearly 8,000 loans directly to small businesses, totaling \$50 million.

NEED FOR LIBERALIZING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear today from Mr. George E. Lewis, representative of the Wisconsin Council of County and Municipal Employees, urging the enactment of the proposed legislation, H. R. 13549, a measure liberalizing social-security benefits.

As we know, there are almost 12 million people in this country who will be benefited if this proposal is approved by Congress, as I believe it should be. In Wisconsin, the standards of living would be "lifted" for more than 281,000 folks.

As passed by the House of Representatives, the provisions of H. R. 13549 are, of course, extremely modest. If further liberalization can be accomplished without (a) too heavy a tax on contributors to the social security fund, or (b) jeopardizing the actuarial soundness of the program itself, then I believe this should be done.

I am pleased that, according to present plans, the Senate Finance Committee will soon conclude its consideration of this important measure. I respectfully urge expeditious action on the bill by the Senate so that there can be final enactment prior to adjournment.

It was particularly gratifying to have this expression of endorsement from Mr. Lewis, representing 2,000 members from the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. I ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,

ROBERT J. OBERBECK, Executive Director.
JOHN A. LAWTON, General Counsel.

August 11, 1958.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I understand that the Senate Finance Committee has or will soon be reporting H. R. 13549 to the Senate floor for action. This bill will increase benefits under Federal old-age, survivors and disability insurance system, improve the actuarial status of a trust fund of such system and make other improvements in the social security act. The two thousand members of the American Federation of State,

County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, in the district of Wisconsin which I represent, are very much interested in the improvements which are proposed in H. R. 13549.

As you know, the problem of the senior citizen is an evergrowing one; the reasons being twofold. One being the everincreasing cost of living and the other the everincreasing number of senior citizens.

We were very disappointed to learn that the Forand bill has no chance in the 85th Congress, but were pleased to be advised that the Mills bill has passed the lower house and would urge your support of the bill in the United States Senate.

I am sure that you know, but I will again call it to your attention that there are many people in Wisconsin who are retiring after long years of public employment who will have no other means of support than social security benefits. The Wisconsin retirement plan is a very good supplement to social security, but unfortunately, many counties and municipalities have not taken advantage of the plan.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. LEWIS,
Representative.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 2266) entitled "An act to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 628) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Indiana desire?

Mr. JENNER. I should like to have 40 minutes.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just let the cat out of the bag. He admits that the bill is a Federal-aid-to-education program.

It matters not how it is tried to dress the old gal; it may be called a defense program; but it is still a Federal-aid-to-education program.

The people of Indiana do not want it; my State does not want it. I shall try

to find some way, if the bill becomes law, to prohibit \$1 of the money from going to the State of Indiana. There is no other State which cannot do what the State of Indiana can do, if the State wants to do it.

We sit here and act as though the Federal Government has the money. Where do we suppose the Federal Government gets the money? It gets it from the people who live in the 48 States.

I think one of the best analyses of the whole matter which I have read is that made by Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York. This is what he said:

I have had the honor to serve in the Congress for 14 years. During much of that time, I have watched with growing apprehension an increasing tendency by many of our people to unload on the Federal doorstep what should be the responsibilities of the family, the local, or the State government.

One of those responsibilities is education.

For the past several years, the halls of Congress have swarmed with advocates of Federal appropriations for school construction, teachers' salaries, vocational education, guidance, scholarships, and fellowships, and student loans.

Mr. President, I depart for a moment from Representative GWINN's remarks. Under the provisions of the bill before the Senate today, it is not necessary for a person to study the subjects he says he will study when he gets the money. He does not have to give any service whatever in return for the money. A person can take the money of the Federal Government as a pure gift and study tap dancing or the arrangement of flowers, or anything else he wishes to do. The money has nothing to do with the national defense. That is only the guise and the emergency which will enable the people who have been working on such a measure all these years to put the nose of the camel under the tent in the last days of this session, and to force something on the people which the people do not want and do not need.

I return to the statement by Representative GWINN:

Each idea for Federal direction of education is couched in terms of an emergency. Each one is inevitably adorned in the trappings of a special situation. The pattern is consistent. We are almost literally asked to believe that the United States will decay in the likeness of ancient Rome unless a Washington bureaucracy assumes command of education.

Up to date, the Congress has resisted these flamboyant appeals in the critical field of education. It has managed to keep its head above water in a veritable flood of unthinking, unreasoning emotions.

But now, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, there is talk and proposed legislation—H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958—for a new Federal venture in education. Obviously, a new scarecrow, another tune on that old saw, national defense.

Mr. President, that statement was made by Representative GWINN on July 30. Here we are on August 13. Everything of which Representative GWINN was fearful has happened. The bill is before the Senate today. We will have to vote on it before 11 o'clock tonight. I continue:

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15877

We are deafened by variations of stale and musty arguments in behalf of this outrageous scheme.

Last year, we were asked to intrude the Federal Government into education—

This was the crisis last year—

that there was a crisis in school construction. That was a dud.

It did not go over. It is sought to revive it here today.

There never was such a boom in school-room construction. This year, we are besieged by a clamor for Federal direction of education on the grounds it is vital to national defense.

Mr. President, I suppose that the teaching of the arrangement of flowers and the teaching of tap dancing might help the national defense; I do not know. But that is what one can do under the bill.

Representative GWINN continues:

What about next year? What will be the emergency in the 86th Congress? We may be sure that the 26-year-old lobby for Federal aid will drum one up.

I shall not be with you,

Representative GWINN says—

My stay in this Chamber nears its end.

Let me interpose to say that I am in the same position.

I shall watch the next Congress from the viewpoint of an average citizen and taxpayer. But I can foresee, at this moment, that the struggle to keep education free is far from ended, and now is the time to prepare for the assault against freedom that is bound to come in 1959.

Mr. President, the assault came sooner than even Representative GWINN realized. It came in August of this year.

The possibility of Federal control of education cannot escape us when we see how many Federal programs incubate and seldom die.

It is not enough to insert a line or paragraph in any bill which states that the Federal Government shall not control education, regardless of the Federal funds allotted to the purpose. No such inclusion is a guaranty. We must bear in mind the blunt fact that wherever there is Federal appropriation, there must be Federal control.

Do we want a central education agency? May God forbid. It is the future and not alone the present we must think about. What assurance can we have against the possibility of some future administration that would seek to conform our youth to its particular way of thinking? There is an old saying that powers lodged in some hands will be respected, but if the same powers are inherited by other hands, they can be destructive.

I have brought together for your files and for your possible guidance in the years ahead a number of quotations on the subject of Federal intervention in education. Some of the statements were made several years ago—and the authors today are in sharp variance with their expressed viewpoints of the past. Other statements are as new as last week.

These quotations may be ammunition for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are determined that education shall not suffer from bondage to the Federal Government. The classroom must remain a lasting evidence of our devotion to the principle of liberty.

Mr. President, Representative GWINN then included various quotations. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

QUOTES OF THE PAST AND PRESENT ON FEDERAL AID

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1949: "I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues." (Quoted by Ross Roy in Vital Speeches.)

President Eisenhower, 1956: "Geographical balance of power is essential to our form of free society. If you take the centralizing shortcut every time something is to be done, you will perhaps sometimes get quick action. But there is no perhaps about the price you will pay for your impatience; the growth of a swollen bureaucratic monster government in Washington, in whose shadow our State and local governments will ultimately wither and die."

President's [Eisenhower] Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958: "The committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

John Foster Dulles, December 28, 1949: "The Federal Government is no independent source of funds. It has to get what it gives. Whatever money it spends for education must be taken away from local communities—from individuals. Why not leave the responsibility with them, where the money is and where the responsibility is normally the deepest and most conscientious?"

"We can be confident that educational responsibilities will generally be discharged at the local level if Federal taxes permit and if we get over the illusion that Federal aid is a financially painless operation. Then our children will get education that is guided by parental and religious care rather than by remote control. And they will be kept beyond the grasp of any who, in the future, might win national power and feel that education ought to conform our youth to their particular way of thinking."

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1957: "The training of young minds is one of the most powerful forces known to civilization. In the wrong hands—in the hands of ruthless men bent on world domination—education can become a dangerous thing."

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, June 1957: "More elementary and secondary school bonds were sold than in any 9-month period in our history. * * * In the past 4 years \$8.8 billion has been spent for school construction—more than had been spent in the preceding 20 years."

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, majority leader, United States Senate, 1958: "The primary direction of education should be in the hands of local government."

"On anything as highly personal as education, our people are entitled to determine the future of their children."

"This means that the school system should be handled by that branch of government which is closest to our people."

The Supreme Court of the United States, 1942, *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U. S. 111-113).

"It is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

Senator HARRY C. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, United States Senate, 1957: "We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of free government."

John M. Stalnaker, president, March 20, 1958, National Merit Scholarship Corp.: "A large Federal program of say 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped."

Commission on Financing Higher Education Association of American Universities, 1952: "The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom, for without that freedom, its attraction to intelligence, its capacity to stimulate investigation and originality, its power to produce free men who will guide our country wisely, and serve it well, will wither. It is this freedom that must be protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government. * * * In these fields (social sciences and humanities) public opinion is notoriously given to snap judgment and in them centralized control could be used to do great damage. * * * Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance."

Enoch R. Needles, president, the Engineers Joint Council, January 1958: "To ascribe the Russian rocket and satellite lead to weakness in American technology is misleading and erroneous."

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president, Wheaton College, 1958: "We believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people."

Henry M. Wriston, president, American Assembly and a State Department consultant, March 1958:

"The bill will smother science and education by making private support unnecessary."

"Whatever you do, my brethren, don't get a built-in dependence of science on war. When fear ends, support will evaporate."

The American Legion, policy approved in national convention, September 16-19, 1957: "The National Government should avoid interference, control or direction in educational processes of programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly or by grants-in-aid, school construction, appropriation, curriculum or program control, or by action of any agency, branch or department of the United States Government."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 1957: "I think this is a responsibility the States and local governments can and should bear."

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "We should preserve as much of our Government as possible as close as possible to the people * * * no nation worth its salt, was ever built from the top down * * * we need more effective work done at the State level, with enough nerve to levy the taxes to get needed work done."

Governor Clyde, of Utah, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Only in those cases where State lines interfere with effective accomplishment should we look to the Great White Father in Washington for assistance."

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 1957: "Once you establish this principle, you will have sounded the death knell of independent State and local systems."

August 13

15878

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "Here's my definition of Federal aid: It means we raise our taxes to send some money to Washington, then we raise more money in order to provide the matching funds. Then we raise more again to pay the brokerage tax, in order to get a fraction of the money back."

Governor Foss, of South Dakota, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "No government at any level has anything to offer free."

Gov. William P. Stratton, of Illinois, 1957: "Many people feel—as I do—that there is great danger, no matter how high sounding the program may be made to appeal to the public, that our system would be damaged, perhaps beyond recovery, by having the Federal Government move into the field of education."

"We do not need Federal aid for schools in Illinois."

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "The unity that is our Federal system relies on the strength of our States * * * in some areas of functions and services, the States can perform more effectively and better and must accept that responsibility."

Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "There is no magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money. It must come from the taxpayers * * * now is the time to take action to resolve the unemployment problems in our own State. * * * I am opposed to borrowing from the Federal Government because it will lead to Federal interference, furthermore, our States can do the job more economically and much better * * * in the highway program we can cut Federal redtape to permit the program to move faster."

Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, of Mississippi, 1957: "All districts can meet needs with State aid * * * Federal aid not needed."

Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958: "There are many sins being committed in the name of education. * * * I recommend a complete overhaul of the tax structure of the Federal Government, with a view of returning some of the sources to the States."

George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, 1957: "No one on the national level is endowed with sufficient knowledge to predetermine accurately the future needs of the whole country. The problem of public school construction is too intricate to be handled by long distance. Too many variable factors are involved in intelligent planning. These factors multiply as we move from the district level to the community level and then to the local school level. It is farcical to think that a program can be developed in Washington to meet the needs of the Nation."

Gov. Harold Handley, of Indiana, 1957: "We are providing these new classrooms twice as fast as the advocates of federalized education say we should be building them."

Governor Handley, of Indiana, July 22, 1958:

"Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence."

"Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually."

Governor Handley wrote me last week that a statewide survey showed that all the high standing students needing financial help had been provided for.

Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, 1957: "Federal school aid would mean they'd try to control our schools."

Gov. Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, 1957: "I am vigorously opposed to any Federal aid program in this field under whatever guise it may be offered. The States and localities are capable of meeting their needs at much greater economy to the taxpayer without Federal aid or intervention in building and operating their public schools."

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, 1957: "The Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which money would be appropriated and made available to the States, through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes."

South Carolina Legislature, 1957: "The people of South Carolina are now, always have been and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment, or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or State governments."

John C. Lynn, legislative director, the American Farm Bureau Federation, March 113, 1958: "Counties and communities throughout the Nation are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction, and efforts are being made to increase teachers' salaries and to improve the overall conditions of our schools. Local people understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation without Federal assistance and without Federal controls."

Mrs. William S. Shary, president, New York Federation of Women's Clubs, April 5, 1958: "The New York State Federation of Women's Clubs * * * affirms its belief in our traditional American principles and policies of State and local support and control of, and responsibility for, education, and urges the Congress to reject provisions for Federal aid to education."

Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1956: "Federal aid means Federal control. You cannot get away from the fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune."

Daughters of the American Revolution, 1957: "The National Society, Daughter of the American Revolution has continuously opposed Federal aid to education, believing such aid could lead to Government control of all public schools, thereby removing State and local control."

Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, president, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., April 2, 1958: "Make no mistake about it, 'one shot' Federal aid is as fantastically unrealistic as only one shot for the dope addict. And there is a mountain of evidence to prove it."

Gordon L. Calvert, July 1958, Investment Bankers Association of America: "The great success with which the needed classrooms rapidly are being provided without Federal aid, the decreasing rate of growth in public school enrollment, the large classroom construction programs presently underway and financed for the next several years (demonstrated by record sales of school bonds and approval of a high percentage of school

bonds at recent bond elections) lead us to conclude that State and local educational agencies can and will provide the needed classrooms without Federal aid."

Southern States Industrial Council: "The council opposes Federal aid to education, including Federal aid to school construction."

National Association of Manufacturers: "The heart of the matter is whether the financing, direction, and control of the public school system shall remain in State and local hands, close to the people and responsive to their wishes and needs, or shall eventually be transferred to a central government authority."

Dr. Brantley Watson, March 1958 Education Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"When our entrance into the space age was dramatized last fall, State and local reaction was immediate and is still mounting. State and local boards of education are reviewing the curriculums, the methods, and the standards of their schools. In community after community, we are finding an aroused leadership insisting on higher standards both for general achievement and for graduation. Local and State legislative leaders, who are constitutionally responsible for public education, are likewise being pressed to provide ways and means to maintain effective schools."

"On the other hand, there are no studies showing that local and State leaders believe that any space age emergency in education exists, which requires Federal intervention in science education, or in guidance, or in scholarships."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, let me quote a few of the statements. The President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, in 1949, said:

I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such a policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely destroy and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues. (Quoted by Ross Roy in Vital Speeches.)

Let us make up our minds whether we want to follow our President or leave him. It is not ancient history. Let me quote President Eisenhower again, in 1956:

Geographical balance of power is essential to our form of free society. If you take the centralizing shortcut every time something is to be done, you will perhaps sometimes get quick action. But there is no perhaps about the price you will pay for your impatience; the growth of a swollen bureaucratic monster government in Washington, in whose shadow our State and local governments will ultimately wither and die.

I have read the President's statement of his beliefs.

I read now from the second report in 1958 of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School:

The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students."

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15879

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, stated, on December 28, 1949:

The Federal Government is no independent source of funds. It has to get what it gives. Whatever money it spends for education must be taken away from local communities—from individuals. Why not leave the responsibility with them, where the money is and where the responsibility is normally the deepest and most conscientious?

We can be confident that educational responsibilities will generally be discharged at the local level if Federal taxes permit and if we get over the illusion that Federal aid is a financially painless operation. Then our children will get education that is guided by parental and religious care rather than by remote control. And they will be kept beyond the grasp of any who, in the future, might win national power and feel that education ought to conform our youth to their particular way of thinking.

Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated in December 1957:

The training of young minds is one of the most powerful forces known to civilization. In the wrong hands—in the hands of ruthless men bent on world domination—education can become a dangerous thing.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey stated in June 1957:

More elementary and secondary school bonds were sold than in any 9-month period in our history. * * * In the past 4 years \$8.8 billion has been spent for school construction—more than had been spent in the preceding 20 years.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] stated in 1958:

The primary direction of education should be in the hands of local government.

On anything as highly personal as education, our people are entitled to determine the future of their children.

This means that the school system should be handled by that branch of government which is closest to our people.

Mr. President, listen to the following statements:

The Supreme Court of the United States, 1942, *Wickard v. Filburn* (317 U.S. 111-113):

It is hardly lack of due process (of law) for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated in 1957:

We must realize that creeping paternalism of the Federal Government is just as bad as creeping socialism. The end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of free government.

John M. Stalnaker, president, National Merit Scholarship Corp., March 20, 1958:

A large Federal program of say 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and State efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped.

Commission on Financing Higher Education, Association of American Universities, 1952:

The strength of higher education is founded upon its freedom and upon the country's freedom, for without that freedom, its attraction to intelligence, its capacity to stimulate investigation and originality, its power to produce freemen who will guide our country wisely, and serve it well will wither. It is this freedom that must be

protected if it becomes dependent upon any dominant support, no matter how beneficent or how enlightened that support may presently appear to be. Such independence will be threatened if higher education is subjected to further influence from the Federal Government * * *. In these fields (social sciences and humanities) public opinion is notoriously given to snap judgment and in them centralized control could be used to do great damage * * *. Direct Federal control would in the end produce uniformity, mediocrity, and compliance.

Enoch R. Needles, president, the Engineers Joint Council, January 1958:

To ascribe the Russian rocket and satellite lead to weakness in American technology is misleading and erroneous.

Dr. V. Raymond Edman, president, Wheaton College, 1958:

We believe that Federal scholarships, good as they may seem on the outside, can be a real handicap to the highest interests of the American people.

Henry M. Wriston, president, American Assembly and a State Department consultant, March 1958:

The bill will smother science and education by making private support unnecessary. Whatever you do, my brethren, don't get a built-in dependence of science on war. When fear ends, support will evaporate.

The American Legion, policy approved in national convention, September 16-19, 1957:

The National Government should avoid interference, control or direction in educational processes of programs of the respective States, either directly or indirectly or by grants-in-aid, school construction, appropriation, curriculum or program control, or by action of any agency, branch or department of the United States Government.

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 1957:

I think this a responsibility the States and local governments can and should bear.

Governor Daniel, of Texas, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

We should preserve as much of our Government as possible as close as possible to the people * * * no nation worth its salt, was ever built from the top down * * * we need more effective work done at the State level, with enough nerve to levy the taxes to get needed work done.

Governor Clyde, of Utah, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

Only in those cases where State lines interfere with effective accomplishment should we look to the Great White Father in Washington for assistance.

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 1957:

Once you establish this principle, you will have sounded the death knell of independent State and local systems.

Governor Simpson, of Wyoming, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

Here's my definition of Federal aid: It means we raise our taxes to send some money to Washington, then we raise more money in order to provide the matching funds. Then we raise more again to pay the brokerage tax, in order to get a fraction of the money back.

Governor Foss, of South Dakota, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

No government at any level has anything to offer free.

Gov. William P. Stratton, of Illinois, 1957:

Many people feel—as I do—that there is great danger, no matter how high sounding the program may be made to appeal to the public, that our system would be damaged, perhaps beyond recovery, by having the Federal Government move into the field of education.

We do not need Federal aid for schools in Illinois.

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

The unity that is our Federal system relies on the strength of our States * * * In some areas of functions and services, the States can perform more effectively and better and must accept that responsibility.

Governor O'Neill, of Ohio, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

There is no magic source from which the Federal Government gets the money. It must come from the taxpayers. * * * Now is the time to take action to resolve the unemployment problems in our own State. * * * I am opposed to borrowing from the Federal Government because it will lead to Federal interference, furthermore, our States can do the job more economically and much better. * * * In the highway program we can cut Federal redtape to permit the program to move faster.

Lt. Gov. Carroll Gartin, of Mississippi, 1957:

All districts can meet needs with State aide. * * * Federal aid not needed.

Governor Chandler, of Kentucky, 50th annual governors' conference, May 1958:

There are many sins being committed in the name of education. * * * I recommend a complete overhaul of the tax structure of the Federal Government, with a view of returning some of the sources to the States.

George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, 1957:

No one on the national level is endowed with sufficient knowledge to predetermine accurately the future needs of the whole country. The problem of public school construction is too intricate to be handled by long distance. Too many variable factors are involved in intelligent planning. These factors multiply as we move from the district level to the community level and then to the local school level. It is farcical to think that a program can be developed in Washington to meet the needs of the Nation.

Gov. Harold Handley, of Indiana, 1957:

We are providing these new classrooms twice as fast as the advocates of federalized education say we should be building them.

Governor Handley, of Indiana, July 22, 1958:

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Governor Handley wrote last week that a statewide survey showed that all the high-standing students needing financial help had been provided for.

Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama, 1957:

15880

Federal school aid would mean they'd try to control our schools.

Gov. Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, 1957:

I am vigorously opposed to any Federal aid program in this field under whatever guise it may be offered. The States and localities are capable of meeting their needs at much greater economy to the taxpayer without Federal aid or intervention in building and operating their public schools.

I read now a resolution of the Indiana Senate:

Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring, 1957, The Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which money would be appropriated and made available to the States through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes.

South Carolina Legislature, 1957:

The people of South Carolina are now, always have been, and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment, or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or State governments.

John C. Lynn, legislative director, the American Farm Bureau Federation, March 13, 1958:

Counties and communities throughout the Nation are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction, and efforts are being made to increase teachers' salaries and to improve the overall conditions of our schools. Local people understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation without Federal assistance and without Federal controls.

Mrs. William S. Shary, president, New York Federation of Women's Clubs, April 5, 1958:

The New York State Federation of Women's Clubs . . . affirms its belief in our traditional American principles and policies of State and local support and control of, and responsibility for, education, and urges the Congress to reject provisions for Federal aid to education.

Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1956:

Federal aid means Federal control. You cannot get away from that fact that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Daughters of the American Revolution, 1957:

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has continuously opposed Federal aid to education, believing such aid could lead to Government control of all public schools, thereby removing State and local control.

Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, president, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., April 2, 1958:

Make no mistake about it, "one shot" Federal aid is as fantastically unrealistic as only one shot for the dope addict. And there is a mountain of evidence to prove it.

Gordon L. Calvert, July 1958, Investment Bankers Association of America:

The great success with which the needed classrooms rapidly are being provided without Federal aid, the decreasing rate of growth in public-school enrollment, the large classroom construction programs presently underway and financed for the next several years (demonstrated by record sales of school bonds and approval of a high percentage of school bonds at recent bond elections) lead us to conclude that State and local educational agencies can and will provide the needed classrooms without Federal aid.

Southern States Industrial Council:

The council opposes Federal aid to education, including Federal aid to school construction.

National Association of Manufacturers:

The heart of the matter is whether the financing, direction, and control of the public-school system shall remain in State and local hands, close to the people and responsive to their wishes and needs, or shall eventually be transferred to a central government authority.

Dr. Brantley Watson, March 1958 education committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

When our entrance into the space age was dramatized last fall, State and local reaction was immediate and is still mounting. State and local boards of education are reviewing the curriculums, the methods, and the standards of their schools. In community after community, we are finding an aroused leadership insisting on higher standards both for general achievement and for graduation. Local and State legislative leaders, who are constitutionally responsible for public education, are likewise being pressed to provide ways and means to maintain effective schools.

On the other hand, there are no studies showing that local and State leaders believe that any space age emergency in education exists, which requires Federal intervention in science education, or in guidance, or in scholarships.

Mr. President, so far as Indiana is concerned, let me say that a few days ago I had printed in the RECORD, a letter which I received from the chief executive of Indiana, Gov. Harold Handley. At this time I shall read the letter to the Senate:

STATE OF INDIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Indianapolis, July 21, 1958.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: A hypothesis is only a hypothesis until it is proven or disproven by facts. Following the launching of Sputnik I, we in Indiana began a thorough factfinding study of our education system, particularly regarding science and mathematics courses, enrollments, and pupil aptitudes. The entire project was conducted by a representative committee of citizens and educators, headed by Dr. Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the University of Notre Dame Law School.

Every Indiana ninth grade student received an identical test, the results being evaluated by a professional laboratory. We also gave an extensive test to high-school senior to determine exceptional individuals.

Then we inquired of these exceptional seniors as to how many wished to enter college and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance.

The results of these tests and inquiries are detailed in the attached summary.

I shall also place it in the RECORD.

I read further from the Governor's letter:

Because there is now before the United States Congress proposed legislation for Federal scholarships, we feel that you might be particularly interested. We are convinced that Indiana does not need such Federal assistance, and that if similar factual inquiry were made in the other States the same conclusions would be tenable regarding them.

Once started, a system of federalized scholarship would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions and institutions now independent or State supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Those are almost the words which were used by President Eisenhower.

The Governor's letter continues, as follows:

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Governor of Indiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the study referred to printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION IN INDIANA SCHOOLS

(By Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction)

Russian advances in the field of satellites have been responsible for criticisms of our science and mathematics education by critics of our educational system. Because of the interest expressed by the school people and the citizens in the veracity of these criticisms, the State superintendent of public instruction appointed a 14-member committee with Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School and a member of the Commission on General Education of the Indiana State Board of Education, to investigate and appraise science and mathematics education in the schools of Indiana. This in part was necessitated because the schools were being blamed for the failure of the United States to launch a satellite before Russia's Sputnik I, and in part because the school people and the citizens wanted to know the truth about Indiana's educational adequacy. The committee has scientifically studied the schools in Indiana to determine the actual facts in five areas of our educational program pertinent to the teaching and achievements in the mathematics and science courses. These areas are as follows: (1) Teacher qualifications; (2) high school offerings; (3) pupil participation; (4) achievement of pupils; and (5) the need for scholarships for talented pupils. To obtain pertinent data the committee used the records of the teacher training and licensing division, the statistical division, and the research division of the State department of public instruction. In addition to this, questionnaires were mailed to all of the 707 Indiana high schools. The fact that 100 percent of the

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15881

questionnaires were returned is indicative of the excellent cooperation and true interest shown by the school administrators in aiding with this quest for the truth. Investigation of the five areas listed above has been completed and a summary of the results is as follows:

TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS

The courses taken in colleges and/or universities by all the teachers of mathematics and science were studied by examining their credentials filed in the teacher training and licensing division of the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. These records show that all mathematics teachers in Indiana have a minimum of 24 semester hours of college credit in mathematics. Data from these files also reveal that approximately 80 percent of the biology, chemistry, and physics teachers have a teaching certificate in their specific area which, in fact, means that the biology teachers have a minimum of 24 semester hours of academic biology, and the chemistry and physics teachers have a minimum of 18 semester hours of academic chemistry and academic physics. All of the other teachers, with the exception of a very small percent, have had at least 15 hours of science. For only 2.2 percent of the biology teachers, 1 percent of the chemistry teachers, and 2.2 percent of the physics teachers were our records incomplete.

HIGH-SCHOOL OFFERINGS

The idea has been prevalent that our high schools no longer offer the challenging and solid courses in mathematics and science. The facts are that during the 1957-58 school year 85 percent of our high schools were offering physics; 83 percent were offering chemistry; 88 percent were offering second-year algebra; 72 percent were offering trigonometry, and 62 percent were offering solid geometry. All of these schools did not offer these subjects each year but offered the courses in alternate years.

PUPIL ENROLLMENT

During the school year 1957-58 the records showed that 100 percent of the graduating seniors had at least 1 year of mathematics; 84 percent had 2 years of mathematics; 15 percent had 3 years of mathematics, and 11 percent had 4 years of mathematics. Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and former United States High Commissioner to Germany, recently used in a nationwide telecast our data that 11 percent of Indiana graduates have 4 years of secondary mathematics, as an indication of the strength of the American comprehensive secondary school. Of this year's (1957-58) graduates, 100 percent had 1 year of science; 26 percent had 2 years of science; 15 percent had 3 years of science; 2 percent had 4 years of science. These figures indicate that about as many high-school pupils in Indiana today are enrolled in advance science and mathematics courses as could profit from the accelerated study of these subjects. This statement assumes that it is the most capable and talented students who are enrolled in these advanced courses.

ACHIEVEMENT OF PUPILS

The science and mathematics committee tested the ninth-grade pupils in mathematics and science. The California Test Bureau of Los Angeles, Calif., was selected to provide the tests in mathematics and science. Schools were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Of the approximately 63,000 pupils enrolled in the ninth grade, over 44,000 students took both the science and the mathematics tests.

The results of these tests have very definitely established the high caliber of our students both in past and present achievement and in the prognostication of their future scholastic ability and achievement.

The tests were validated on the national norms previously established and grade placements were also derived and ascertained from these national norms.

In the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th-grade students was at the 10th grade. Approximately 27 percent of the total number of 9th-grade students taking the test showed a grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more, while approximately 58 percent showed grade equivalents at or above the 10th year grade level.

In the area of physical science, the median grade level for these 9th grade students was at the 9th grade level; however, 36 percent of the students taking the physical science exam showed a 10th grade equivalent or more.

In the area of biological science, the median grade level was the ninth grade, the same as in the area of physical science. Thirty-four percent of the 9th grade students taking this test placed at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

Results show that 61.6 percent were above the national norms in mathematical reasoning and mathematical fundamentals, and 50.7 percent were above the national norms in physical and biological sciences. More students were above the national norms in physical science than in biological science because many city schools offer biology to 10th grade students while the test was given to 9th grade students.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

"How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?"

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½-hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were sent to Yonkers, N. Y., where they were machine scored.

There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into 4 categories:

1. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I—that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile based on national norms in each of the four fields of mathematics, science, English, and social studies.

2. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the 4 areas tested.

3. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in the group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college.

Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient funds to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid for amounts from \$10 to \$1,200. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 were needed and can be taken care of but the problem concerns provision for financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

The results of the study of these five areas have shown conclusively that the training and education directed to our students do not in any way preclude their ability to achieve and to meet the challenges of our changing world.

The facts do show that our schools are very adequately meeting the needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for unfavorable criticisms concerning Indiana's educational system. The aims, the objectives, and the philosophy of our schools sharpen and challenge the working tools of the pupils. Since progress is an important product, our youth will not mark time but will keep pace with all the developmental tasks that our culture expects of them.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE FIVE AREAS

Teacher qualifications: The records of Indiana's mathematics and science teachers show that they are well qualified to teach in these subject areas.

High school offerings: Indiana's high schools are definitely offering adequate mathematics and science courses to meet the needs of our challenging students.

Pupil enrollment: The records show that Indiana's high school seniors for 1957-58 had a firm and substantial background in both mathematics and science.

Achievement of pupils: Results of a mathematics and science test showed that in the area of mathematics, the median grade level for Indiana's 9th grade students was at the 10th grade. A large percentage of these students ranked at the grade equivalent of 13 (college level) or more.

In the science area, the median grade level was the 9th grade, while a large percentage ranked at the 10th grade equivalent or more.

The need for scholarships for talented pupils: A 4½-hour comprehensive examination (essential high school content battery, form BM.) was taken by 703 qualified high school seniors.

One hundred and ninety-nine or 28.3 percent of these 703 seniors made a percentile ranking, based on national norms, above 90; however, the committee decided not to consider for scholarship, at this time, those students who had an average percentile ranking of 94 or below in the areas of mathematics and science, and an average percentile ranking of 90 or below in the areas of English and social studies. This eliminated 20 of the 199 students.

By process of further elimination according to pupil interest, course of study pursued, and a financial need formula; only 53 students, who were still qualified, remained.

A plan is being devised whereby those 53 students needing financial assistance may obtain this aid from private sources in Indiana. The committee is convinced that Federal assistance on this program is neither necessary nor desirable.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, many arguments can be made in opposition to the pending bill, which now is called the defense education bill. However, at this time I shall refer to only two arguments against the so-called defense education bill, as it is called today. It used to be referred to as the bill for Federal aid to education; but now we are told that it is a bill for the purpose of defense—in other words, that it is a defense activity when a student studies how to arrange flowers or how to dance. So now the bill is called a defense bill.

Either of the two arguments I shall now submit is a sufficient reason for the defeat of the bill:

First. We do not want the Federal Government's heavy hand on the education of our young people. Federal financing must, under the law, be accompanied by Federal supervision.

Second. The Federal Government has no money. Every dollar appropriated by such a bill would be paid in red ink, thus sending our deficit ever higher for years to come, if not forever. State and local governments and private agencies are ready and willing to meet their responsibilities, but they will not be able to raise the money if the Federal Government takes it first.

NO CASE FOR FEDERAL FUNDS

No case has been made for Federal financial aid for any part of the educational job, except for short-run Federal contributions for local areas hit by military installations, and so forth. The necessity for Federal contributions to local areas which have been affected by military installations and such is the only real justification for such Federal aid. But that aid has already been given by the Congress, and it should continue to be given.

However, the system now proposed would be a blanket system.

The statistics submitted in support of Federal contributions are among the most discredited arguments ever submitted to Congress. Representative RALPH GWINN and others have completely punctured their validity.

The defense education proposals are no whit better than all the preceding ones. They were thrown together hastily, in an attempt to achieve under the influence of the sputniks, the same tired, old programs for federalization that Congress had withstood again and again.

THE GIFTED NEEDY

The argument that many gifted students cannot complete their education because they lack the means is one of the most dishonest of all the arguments used in connection with this subject. I repeat, Mr. President, the argument that many gifted students cannot complete their education because they lack the means to do so is one of the most dishonest of all the arguments.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Indiana, Wilbur Young, sent me a letter in which he analyzed a complete study which was made in the State of Indiana. I ask my colleagues to consider what that study shows. I stress the point that the situation which has been found to exist in Indiana will likewise be found to exist in other States.

Mr. President, the Senate is asked to act on a bill about which it does not have the bona fide facts. Instead, the Senate is requested to act on the basis of propaganda and dishonest arguments.

The study which was made in Indiana showed the following:

Estimated students of high ability in math or science, but lacking funds, 2,000.

Students who appeared for scholarship examinations, 703.

So, Mr. President, at that point approximately 1,300 students had dropped out; even though they were qualified, they did not wish to attend college, and therefore they did not appear to take the scholarship examinations. The question of finances was not involved.

Of the 703 who appeared to take the scholarship examinations, only 199 were above the 90th percentile; and I guess that is what we want. If we are to have a defense program, we want students who will take mathematics and science, and we want high-quality students.

Now, notice the figures. Those in financial need of from only \$10 to \$1,200 a year numbered 53 students in the entire State of Indiana, out of a population of 4½ million. I will lay anyone odds that if the rest of the States made a comprehensive study of their situation, their figures would be comparable to those of Indiana.

Of the 53, we have scholarships not even being used, but we will forget about that. The State chamber of commerce of my State is now publicly establishing a fund of \$50,000 to lend to those students. Oh, no, not to give to them. Under the Federal program, the money will be given to students. So they are all going to take it. Good old Uncle Sam's gravy train comes along again. Only 53 lacked finances, and the money will be made available to them, but they will have to pay it back after they get their education. That is the way we do business in Indiana, and some of the other States had better start copying it, or we shall all go down the drain together.

DISTORTION OF STUDIES

We need more and harder work of higher quality in science and mathematics. Does that prove we do not need more students, more work and higher quality in the liberal arts, and so forth?

It is said that mathematics is the basis of this bill, but a student will be able to study whatever he wants to. He will be able to do what he pleases, and he will not be obligated to pay the money back.

Even for the single object of defeating the Communists we may have as much need of diplomats, writers, businessmen, and lawyers as we have of engineers and scientists.

Military weapons are not our only recourse in the struggle. We need non-

scientific experts in government and politics, to be sure even our scientific and military programs are not sabotaged, because the truth of it is that the most valuable secrets of this Nation were stolen from our laboratories and given to our enemies by the scientists and the smart boys, who were Americans.

Why should the Federal Government intervene and distort the shape of our educational efforts? The decision on how much science and mathematics—as against languages and psychology—our students need is the business of educators. Neither Congress nor the Federal executive has any business in the picture.

PLENTY OF LEADERSHIP IN STATE AND PRIVATE AGENCIES

Does anyone seriously argue that either State or private agencies are incapable of understanding the nature of the present crisis or meeting it? Are we claiming that only bureaucrats in Washington are concerned about the defense needs of our country?

I do not know any issue which has aroused such vigorous, enlightened immediate response among our people as this.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce is evidence of the sense of responsibility and quick response of private business. They were able not only to raise the money they needed, but to mobilize some of the best educational leaders of the State for professional advice. They were fully supported by the Indiana State educational authorities.

FEDERAL FINANCING IS FEDERAL CONTROL

Not a dollar of Federal money can be spent without supervision by Federal bureaucrats of how the money is spent.

The real result—and perhaps the real objective—of the Federal scholarship programs is uniform Federal examinations with Federal steering of students where the Government wants them to go. We want no uniform Federal examinations. This is the leftwing pressure for compulsory uniformity.

We want no Federal rosters of who are and who are not good students. What chance would a scholar have for a Federal grant if all his work was against the trend to central control?

I ask, What chance would I have of getting a Federal grant when I have been fighting these things publicly? It would be said, "He does not conform. He does not fit. He cannot be molded. We do not want him."

I do not want the Federal Government ever to put its clammy hand on the free educational system of this country, because if it does, it will be delving into the home and the church and local governments, and no good can come of it.

Selection of students by ability is the very mechanism by which the Soviet Union gets so much control over young people and over the next generation of professional leaders.

Students are wise, and soon realize they had better say nothing critical of the Federal Government, and then they will not lose out later.

THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM

There are gimmicks in this program, providing funds for psychological test-

ing, which are dangerous instruments for thought control.

Section 701 authorizes the appropriation of \$15 million a year for programs of testing and guidance and counseling. It is also in section 501 and section 207. It is all through the bill.

Let us not be deceived by the small amount. The nose of the camel is always small.

Let us not be deceived by the innocent-sounding name. This business of testing and guidance and counseling smells to high heaven. It is the special thought-control branch of the educationists.

We worry about Russia. About 30 years ago Russia adopted our system of education. Thirty years ago we adopted the system of Columbia University. Now the proponents want thought control. The Federal Government is going to guide and counsel—\$15 million worth of it, just to start.

Some of my colleagues may remember that during the debate on the Japanese peace treaty I discussed the influence of UNESCO in our schools. These tests have been used to overemphasize sex, to set up conflicts between parents and children, between races and between sections, for internationalism and against our Constitution. Then the results are kept secret in files parents cannot see.

Reports by the educationists themselves show that the guidance departments are those for which the students have the least respect.

This innocent little appropriation is almost the worst thing in the bill, because it opens Pandora's box so that almost anything in the way of national control of ability, fitness, and the rest can be imposed on our States and indirectly on our private institutions.

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the other half of the story.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JENNER. As I understood the matter with the leadership, I was to have all the time I wanted. Otherwise, I would not have agreed to the unanimous consent request. I am going to insist I be permitted to finish.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. JENNER. I do not know. I had to get this material together very hurriedly. I did not know until 11:15 last night the bill was going to be up for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator give some idea of the time he may need?

Mr. JENNER. Perhaps 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Indiana, and more time if he needs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Federal Government has no money. It is in a pitiful financial condition. The administration is now before the Committee on Finance saying, "It is necessary to raise the debt limit a second time

this year." Despite that, we are talking about passing bills to spend more money which we do not have.

In the books that were closed on the 30th of this June, the Federal Government added another \$2.8 billion of debt. In the year we have just entered, Secretary Anderson estimates that the deficit will be \$12 billion. But we do not yet know how many mandatory spending bills will come out of this spending Congress. I think this is the worst spending Congress in the history of this country, and it is all done in peacetime. Of one thing we can be sure: The deficit will not be less than \$12 billion for fiscal 1959, or \$15 billion for the 2 years.

I think it is time we took responsibility for studying this debt from the political instead of the financial point of view.

Our problem is not the addition of \$2 billion or \$15 billion to the public debt. Our problem is the successful operation of an inner steering committee which is determined that the American Government shall not get out of the red, ever.

Its objectives are simple. Deficit financing erodes the value of the dollar, it is true. But that is not its most important effect. Deficit financing erodes the middle classes.

Now do Senators see why we have one lovely program after another for more Government spending, but never any workable plans for paying off the debt?

An honest stable dollar is the most important instrument for all productive enterprises, which pay out only after long, hard work. A dishonest dollar is the most important instrument for speculation, gambling, fly-by-night enterprises, where returns can be raked in quickly.

The question before us is not: Do we want another billion-dollar deficit. The question is: Do we want a Government fiscal policy which encourages production and enterprise or one which puts a premium on speculation?

If one is thrifty and saves his own money, and uses it to buy a house or a farm or start a business, one needs a dollar of constant value so he can calculate his risks. Only where financial order prevails can men take risks for the long term, or start the kind of projects which require years for the harvest.

When the value of the dollar is no longer predictable, prudent men give up their plans for productive enterprise. Speculators and gamblers move in and take over, or governments or some man on a white horse. Everything is designed for quick returns.

Productive enterprises wither on the vine, but fly-by-night operators grow richer and richer. The growth area of the economy is injured. With each passing year the damage grows worse. The shell of a great productive economy remains, but its substance is full of air pockets.

Let me carry my point one step further. Which is more important for strengthening American economic superiority in war—a national economy which encourages in every way the healthy growth of productive enterprise, or one which gives all the advantages to the speculator and quick-change artists?

Now we see why the question of deficit financing can never be settled if we look at it only from the view of financial statistics and forget that finance is the most powerful lever in all political action.

I ask Senators to go back to see how we got into this morass.

After 1933 the New Dealers talked of deficit financing, but we remember we were to spend in hard times, and pay back in good times. During the thirties the debt rose steadily to a total of \$50 billion in 1939.

Did we go back to \$50 billion when the war was over? No. For the calendar year 1945 the debt was \$259 billion. Obviously, if we had really turned to deficit financing as a depression remedy, we would have paid off a large part of the debt after 1945. But no; almost without interruption the debt crept up. Instead of a reduction of tens of billions in the 13 prosperous years from 1945 to today, we had an increase of \$17 billion. Even if we allow for the entire cost of the Korean war, we have not made the slightest reduction from the high of World War II.

Senators will say the Communists are responsible. And I say "nonsense." We do not need more money for preparation for war against the Communists than we spent to defeat the Nazis, Fascists, and Japanese combined.

Of course, weapons are more complex, but much of the increased cost of tanks and planes is the result of devaluation of the dollar.

I said "nonsense" because either we are serious in our talk about defending our country against the Communists, or we are not. If we are serious, we must end at once the soft, easy method of paying for defense by red-ink financing. We must decide on the Defense Establishment we need, and then cut down all other items in the budget so total spending will gradually decline.

Deficit spending is a blot. It is national suicide when we may at any moment have to carry another world war.

The Soviet Union has squeezed all the blood out of its finances. It is building up its hoards of gold. Meanwhile we are adding to the blot in our economic system, and letting our thin underpinning of gold be sifted out of our coffers by foreign demand.

You remember how the Communists recently told their workers to turn in the money which represented their war-time savings, and get revalued rubles in return. The Soviet rulers were telling their people the simple truth—they did not have any savings. They were paid, in war-time, in inflated money, with no backing. Instead of letting the poison of inflation go all through the economic system, the Communists lanced their economy, drained out the poisoned money, and told their people they were poor and in pain, but cleansed of their infection and ready to start fresh.

The Soviet government has continuously built up its supplies of gold by mining in the Arctic, in the Urals, perhaps by international transactions we know nothing about. I suppose they have a good part of ours.

The United States has taken none of the bloat out of our economic system. Our enterprises were so fantastically productive that our real wealth did increase, but we increased our red-ink spending so fast that the dollar fell to half its value. At the same time we put restrictions on our gold miners so that nothing is added to our supply of mined gold. When gold is drawn out by international trade, we have no way to maintain the balance.

What I am saying is clear.

Everything which leads to deficit spending—and that is what this bill would lead to—is a military handicap to the United States. It is weakening us in preparation for the total war where any strength or weakness may be decisive.

It is incredible silliness for the Federal Government, in its weak financial position, to finance one grand spending project after another—with red ink budgets. It is not silly, but something far more ominous, for the American Government to engage in this continuous warfare spending, with a glaze of defense spending, when the deadly contest with the might of the Soviet Union may be no farther away than tomorrow morning.

SPENDING GOVERNMENTS NOTHING NEW

The problem of restraining the Government from spending as it likes is not new. It is eternal.

We can find all the evidence of why government spending is political decadence in the experience of Athens, of Rome, of France under the kings and the Republic.

The Founding Fathers knew it as an old story.

Jefferson warned:

I place economy among the most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy with liberty, or profusion with servitude. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money, forbids it in the disposition of public money.

We must endeavor to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the very principle of government. * * * The multiplication of public offices, increase of expense beyond income, growth of the public debt, are indications soliciting the employment of the pruning knife. * * * It is incumbent on every generation to pay its own debt as it goes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks sundry editorials; two communications from Wilbur Young, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Indiana; a letter from John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which opposes this proposed legislation very strenuously; a communication from the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce; and a communication from Clarence Manion, a member of the Indiana State Board of Education and chairman of a special committee which has just completed an 8-month survey of mathematics and science in Indiana schools.

There being no objection, the editorials and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of August 9, 1958]

JENNER FEARS UNITED STATES COLLEGE CONTROL

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Federal direction of college graduates' careers may result from the Federal scholarship program, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, Republican, of Indiana, warned today.

Teeling off on the administration's \$1 billion scholarship aid program, JENNER said: "The real result or objective of the plan is uniform Federal examinations with Federal steering of the students where the Government wants them to go."

He added:

"We want no uniform Federal examinations. This is the leftwing pressure of compulsory uniformity. We want no Federal rosters of who or who are not good students."

Under such a Federal grant program, JENNER said that students soon would "realize they had better say nothing critical of the Federal Government or they'll lose out later."

The administration's proposal is for 20,000 4-year scholarships a year ranging from \$500 to \$1,000 for bright students.

In an interview with the News, the Indiana Republican said:

"No case ever had been made for Federal financing in any part of the educational job, except for short run contributions in federally impacted areas.

"The statistics supporting this Federal contribution program are among the most discredited arguments ever submitted to Congress."

Jenner objected also that the scholarship proposal had been tied in with the Nation's defense program. He said the program was thrown together hastily to achieve under the influence of the sputniks the same old tired proposals that Congress has withstood time and time again.

Using Indiana as an example of the misstatements of the scholarship advocates, JENNER said they had estimated some 2,000 Hoosier high school pupils had high mathematical ability but no money to go to college.

When the time came for scholarship examinations, however, only 700 pupils competed. There were 199 boys and girls who qualified as "bright" pupils, he said, and of that number there were only 53 who needed financial assistance.

JENNER also praised the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce for setting up a \$50,000 scholarship fund to educate Hoosier boys and girls.

The Senator also criticized the program for being almost entirely slanted toward science.

"Does this mean we are to ignore the other arts?" he asked. "When it comes to a single objective of defeating communism we may find we have a greater need for writers, diplomats, businessmen, lawyers."

He concluded by observing that he has seen "no indication whatever either local or private agencies are unable of understanding or meeting any local crisis in education."

Congressman CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indianapolis Republican, also spoke out against Federal aid to education, saying it comes before Congress each session in a different disguise.

"Federal aid to education which, today, shows up in a space suit, will appear tomorrow in a surgeon's gown, next year in a professor's robe and the year after that in an engineer's tweed suit," Brownson said.

"There is no end to the disguises" available and likewise no end to the spending

possibilities of this masquerade," he concluded.

ANTIDOTE TO FEDERAL AID?

The Senate Labor Committee which approved a \$1,500,000,000 Federal aid to education bill—partly for college scholarships—should have looked first to Indiana.

An effective antidote for the creeping disease of Federal aid to education is being offered by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. This group of leading businessmen from all parts of the State has created its own scholarship aid program.

It has been done through establishment of a private foundation incorporated by 17 members which will give scholarships to supplement the resources of high school graduates who wish to go to college. Pupils interested in science and mathematics will receive first attention.

By almost any criterion, the State chamber's program measures up to a sounder and more logical way to aid needy young men and women.

In the matter of economics alone, it is far superior to any Federal program which would be financed entirely from the taxpayers' money, with a loss of about 30 percent in administrative costs.

The State chamber's plan is tailored to the need of Indiana, something that would be impossible in any Federal scholarship program operated by bureaucrats on the remote Potomac.

The private foundation will aid needy pupils in a list selected by a committee appointed by Governor Handley which had made a painstaking survey. It should be pointed out that the survey found that the need was far less acute than had been dramatized by overzealous advocates of Federal aid.

We believe it is significant that industrial and business leaders in Indiana are accepting their responsibilities toward higher education.

It is gratifying that the State chamber of commerce has taken its positive action. As long as there is such leadership in the cause of higher education there will be no reason at all for the meddling hand of Federal bureaucracy to reach into our schools and colleges.

The bill has not received full Senate approval yet. We hope that it never does, for we have a better way in Indiana.

[From the Indianapolis Star]

INDIANA POINTS THE WAY

Despite the increasingly bad condition of the Federal budget, a renewed effort is being made to push an aid-to-education measure through the present Congress. A proposal in the House would cost about \$1,070,000,000. The Senate has a bill which would cost about \$1,500,000,000. Both would project the Federal Government into student selection and curriculums planning in both public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Eisenhower's backing of the proposition is tempered by his insistence that Federal scholarships for college students should not be as numerous as these bills provide, and that they should be based on need. Both are good points.

The fact of the matter is that the question of need argues against any action at the present time. If scholarships are to be based on need, Congress has no way to determine how many should be provided nor how much money will be required. It has no figures at all—except pure guesses—on how many able students are prevented by shortage of money from going to college. Without this information, an intelligent program cannot be set up.

While the new campaign to push this Federal aid bill through was being launched, further action was being carried out in In-

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15885

diana which shows that the Federal program is not needed here at all. We doubt that it is needed elsewhere. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce announced the establishment of a foundation to help capable and needy students through college. It is making grants totaling about \$37,000 to 51 graduates of Indiana high schools in this year's class who were identified in the Manion committee survey as promising students who did not have enough resources for their first college year. The committee narrowed the field to 54 who had the ability and needed help, out of a starting group of 2,000 based on the estimates of high-school principals. Some of these already had scholarships, which were not enough to bridge the gap. Three subsequently obtained adequate scholarships. The other 51 will be provided the necessary help by the new foundation.

This is an example of the sensible way to help capable students through college. First find out how many have both the ability and the need, and how much the need is. Then meet the need.

Besides being a badly aimed shot at the target of college financial problems, the Federal proposals include substantial other items of teacher training, equipment, and student counseling in the public schools. These are objectionable as Federal intrusions into fields better left to local financing and local control.

Meanwhile, what happened to the highly desirable proposal, advanced in the House by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, for Federal income tax relief for parents or others carrying the load of college expenses? Here is a plan which would provide quick and sure help directly at the point of need, where the bills are being paid. The concern in Congress for helping to get students through college could be excellently expressed by enacting this measure.

[From the Indianapolis Times]

INDIANA MEETS A "CRISIS"

Indiana's State Chamber of Commerce appears to have coped effectively and adequately this week with another "crisis in education."

Not, to be sure, a very big crisis—no matter what they have been saying about it in Washington, or how many billions of dollars they have been wanting to spend on its solution.

This one, indeed, turned out finally to involve a total of 53 young men and women in Indiana, and a total of \$37,000 in money.

There is a bill pending before Congress just now appropriating more than \$1 billion which is somewhat more than the total taxes of 1 million American families for a whole year to provide college scholarships for outstandingly brilliant young high school graduates. According to its advocates many thousands of such youngsters want to go to college but cannot because they cannot come up with the necessary money.

An Indiana study commission took the standards of scholarship provided by the Federal aid folks and applied them to this year's senior classes in all Indiana high schools. The total number was somewhat smaller than alarmist reports from Washington had been indicating. Then the commission surveyed all the Hoosier youngsters who fell into this select group which would qualify for Federal aid under the pending bill, and took a look at their own college plans.

It found all but 53 of them were going to college on their own, without Federal or any other help from the taxpayers.

Those 53 did have a problem, which some of them were not sure they were going to be able to solve, of meeting their own college expenses.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce simply set up a fund to take care of all 53, and a

continuing program for meeting like needs in future.

The total cost this year will be \$37,000—none of it tax money. Less, perhaps, than it would cost just to administer and spend the Federal aid proposed for Indiana alone under the legislation now before Congress, before any student got enough aid to buy a notebook.

That takes care of another crisis.

Unfortunately it probably will not be the last. These have been bobbing up incessantly since about 1916 and have been turned down by virtually every session of Congress for the past 50 years. Not always the same crisis, of course. Sometimes it has been shortages of teachers, sometimes of classrooms, sometimes of other educational facilities. So we feel fairly safe in assuming there will be another one next year and still another the year after, and so on, each as phony as the one before it.

Slowly, however, it is beginning to dawn on taxpayers and their Representatives in Congress alike, that the real objective of this whole half-century campaign is to get the Federal Government in control of the schools, as the first step toward control of the minds and the thoughts of the next generation, and nothing more than that.

The Indiana survey has exploded one more in the long series of myths on the subject, and the chamber of commerce program has once again demonstrated their absurdity.

We doubt if the Federal aiders will quit trying, though.

Absurdity has never stopped them before.

[From the Indianapolis Star
of August 7, 1958]

INDIANA POINTS THE WAY

Despite the increasingly bad condition of the Federal budget, a renewed effort is being made to push an aid to education measure through the present Congress. A proposal in the House would cost about \$1,070 million. The Senate has a bill which would cost about \$1,500 million. Both would project the Federal Government into student selection and curricula planning in both public schools and institutions of higher learning.

President Eisenhower's backing of the proposition is tempered by his insistence that Federal scholarships for college students should not be as numerous as these bills provide, and that they should be based on need. Both are good points.

The fact of the matter is that the question of need argues against any action at the present time. If scholarships are to be based on need, Congress has no way to determine how many should be provided nor how much money will be required. It has no figures at all—except pure guesses—on how many able students are prevented by shortage of money from going to college. Without this information, an intelligent program cannot be set up.

While the new campaign to push this Federal aid bill through was being launched, further action was being carried out in Indiana which shows that the Federal program is not needed here at all. We doubt that it is needed elsewhere. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce announced the establishment of a foundation to help capable and needy students through college. It is making grants totaling about \$37,000 to 51 graduates of Indiana high schools in this year's class who were identified in the Manion committee survey as promising students who did not have enough resources for their first college year. The committee narrowed the field to 54 who had the ability and needed help, out of a starting group of 2,000 based on the estimates of high school principals. Some of these already had scholarships, which were not enough to bridge the gap. Three subsequently ob-

tained adequate scholarships. The other 51 will be provided the necessary help by the new foundation.

This is an example of the sensible way to help capable students through college. First find out how many have both the ability and the need, and how much the need is. Then meet the need.

Besides being a badly aimed shot at the target of college financial problems, the Federal proposals include substantial other items of teacher training, equipment and student counseling in the public schools. These are objectionable as Federal intrusions into fields better left to local financing and local control.

Meanwhile, what happened to the highly desirable proposal, advanced in the House by Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, for Federal income tax relief for parents or others carrying the load of college expenses? Here is a plan which would provide quick and sure help directly at the point of need, where the bills are being paid. The concern in Congress for helping to get students through college could be excellently expressed by enacting this measure.

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, August 6, 1958.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: Last February all of the Indiana high-school principals estimated that there were approximately 2,000 high-school seniors in our State with high ability in mathematics and science who did not have enough money to go to college. When the opportunity presented itself on April 19, and for 1 month later, for any high-school senior to take a comprehensive 4½-hour examination in mathematics, science, English, and social studies; only 703 seniors availed themselves of the opportunity.

We learned, after the tests were machine-scored, that 199 of this group ranked above the 90 percentile in mathematics and science. We eliminated those who stated they had enough money to go to college; intended to major in fields other than mathematics and science; or were eliminated by the need formula. Final results revealed that there were only 53 who qualified for financial aid from \$10 to \$1,200.

The Indiana Chamber of Commerce immediately went into action and raised \$37,000 for the 53 students. Each is now guaranteed a year's work in college as far as finances are concerned.

I am confident if the other States of the Union had made a similar study to the one made in Indiana and had provided the necessary financial effort as was done by the State chamber of commerce, there would be no need for the Federal-aid scholarship bill.

I, therefore, urge you to do all you can to defeat H. R. 13247.

If this legislation becomes a law providing just one scholarship instead of 23,000, a furrow has been broken in fertile prairie territory permitting erosion to take place during the future generations.

Sincerely yours,
WILBUR YOUNG,
State Superintendent of Public
Instruction.

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, August 12, 1958.
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.
DEAR BILL: This editorial from today's (Tuesday's) Indianapolis Star is typical of the reaction throughout Indiana. The people of our State are genuinely aroused by the hodgepodge bill passed by the House, for, as the editorial points out, the Federal schol-

arship proposal is being used as the Trojan horse to impose direct Federal grants on many phases of public education.

The Hoosier Republican delegation voted solidly as their constituents wished and as their own good judgment dictated, particularly in view of the conclusive and irrefutable study made by the Manion committee. I am sure that you will do everything possible—not only at the time of any voting but long before—to stop this nefarious bill in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR YOUNG,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

AID SHOWS ITS COLORS

In their eagerness to get a bill passed by the House, the promoters of Federal aid to education laid their objectives out in the open. The measure which has so energetically been promoted as a scholarship plan was passed by the House—without the scholarships.

If the Senate should pass a scholarship bill, perhaps scholarships could be put back into a final measure in conference committee. But that will be a matter of small concern to the Federal aid group. They have what they want in the bill which passed the House. They have a program of grants to public schools for purchase of equipment for specified types of educational programs. They have a program of grants to be used in teacher training. They have a program of federally supervised student counseling and guidance in the public schools. These are what the Federal aid promoters want—the devices of Federal intervention in the operation and direction of the public schools.

The bill which passed the House does contain a loan program for the aid of students in college. But the probable impact of this program is, we think, grossly overestimated. We suspect that it would have been sacrificed just as readily as the scholarships plan was tossed out, if it had been necessary to get the public school intervention bill through.

The nine Republican Representatives from Indiana deserve credit for supporting an unsuccessful attempt to kill the bill by sending it back to the Education Committee. We commend them for that. We don't quite understand, though, why they then curled up and permitted the measure to be passed without a record vote.

The only chance of saving the Nation's school systems from this assault now rests with the Senate. We hope cooler heads will be in the majority there. If they needed any help in seeing the proposition clearly, the House has provided such help. During House debate the measure was referred to as "a crazy bill," and "a hydraheaded monstrosity." The accuracy of those terms was more than ever obvious when the House got through with the bill.

The Senate can preserve sanity in this matter by rejecting this barefaced bid for Federal strings on the public schools.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., August 12, 1958.
Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to S. 4237 and the program of Federal scholarships, student loans, and the other forms of Federal aid to general education contained in the proposal. This program involves the beginning of Federal intervention and control in the operation of our public educational system. We believe the needs of our public education system can best be met through the utilization of State and local funds and resources.

While creative and research talent is always in short supply, there is ample evi-

dence that our technically trained manpower supply, if properly and fully utilized, is adequate for both our economic and military needs. The real question is how we utilize the engineering and scientific talent we have available, not how we quickly develop such talent. We do not believe that the program of Federal assistance to education proposed in S. 4237 will necessarily provide any better utilization of our scientific and engineering resources.

With the Federal debt at an all time high, the farm bureau believes this is no time to embark on a new Federal spending program for education. Federal aid will not solve our educational problems.

We urge that you oppose the passage of S. 4237.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

INDIANA STATE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, August 6, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I think you will be interested in the enclosed copy of the news release which was given to newspapers and press associations the afternoon the State chamber's new educational foundation was established (Monday, August 4). It puts some emphasis on phases of the foundation's purposes which we believe to be just as important as the making of scholarship loans to qualified students who cannot get aid through already existing scholarship grants or loan funds.

As noted in the news release, the new foundation will: First, "work with Indiana colleges and universities and local organizations to help high-school students locate existing scholarships or loan funds."

The State superintendent's study committees found instances where students had failed to find financial aid simply because the students didn't know how to get the information. When establishment of the foundation was being discussed by our board, 1 member said there was a fund already existing which could take care of 3 qualified students from his own county (Howard) who had been listed by the committee. By acting as a clearinghouse through which students and sources of financial aid can be brought together, we feel the foundation can serve one of its most useful purposes.

The second purpose of the foundation is "to encourage establishment of additional local student-aid programs by civic groups and businesses in Hoosier communities."

We believe that as our program develops we can create a greater feeling of local responsibility than now exists for providing aid to outstanding students in the community who need it.

The third purpose is "to establish a loan fund from which to finance the higher education of qualified students who cannot obtain aid from other sources."

This final purpose is designed to assure that no Hoosier student who meets the scholastic qualifications, and cannot obtain needed aid from other sources, will be denied the opportunity to go to college because of lack of finances.

You will note in our release that for this first year the foundation will make loans only to the math and science specialists found by the State superintendent's office to be in need of financial help. There just isn't time to set up our own qualification procedures between now and the opening of fall college terms. The program probably will be expanded to other fields next year.

In our studies preceding establishment of our foundation, we learned that there are at least two similar programs in other States (Maine and Massachusetts). There may be others.

Certainly the official Indiana survey of the State superintendent of public instruction showed how grossly exaggerated are the claims of those who want to put the Federal Government—already debt ridden and operating at a deficit—into the scholarship and school business as a "defense" measure. These things are the responsibility of private individuals, the States, and communities, and we want to keep that responsibility in Indiana.

I hope that you, and others who think as you and we do, can stop once more the people who continually want to use Federal aid as a means to get their hands on the institutions which educate American youth.

Cordially yours,

JACK E. REICH,
Executive Vice President.

RELEASE FROM INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Creation of a foundation to assist qualified Hoosier students in financing college educations was announced today by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce following a meeting of its board of directors at the Indianapolis Athletic Club.

For the first year, aid will be limited to high school graduates intending to major in science and mathematics. In subsequent years, other fields of education may be included, according to Clarence A. Jackson, State chamber president.

Purposes of the new foundation, Mr. Jackson said, will be:

1. To work with Indiana colleges and universities and local organizations to help high school students locate existing scholarships or loan funds for which they are qualified;

2. To encourage establishment of additional local student-aid programs by civic groups and businesses in Hoosier communities;

3. To establish a loan fund from which to finance the higher education of qualified students who cannot obtain aid from other sources.

Foundation funds will be raised independently of the normal membership funds of the State chamber and the foundation will function as a separate nonprofit corporation.

Scholastic requirements will be established and eligibility for aid will be determined by an advisory committee of educators. Standards of "need" for financial aid probably will follow those already set up by the State's various educational institutions, Mr. Jackson said.

Glenn W. Thompson of Columbus, a past president of the State Chamber and president of the DePauw University board of trustees, was elected president of the foundation. J. Ralph Thompson of Seymour, vice president of the Purdue board of trustees, was elected vice president. Other officers are Otto N. Frenzel of Indianapolis, treasurer, and Jack E. Reich, executive vice president of the chamber, secretary. Lothair Teetor of Hagerstown was named fund raising chairman.

The chamber president said because of shortness of time the students who will be considered for assistance in the fall term this year will be limited to the 53 scholastically qualified high school graduates found by a recent survey of the State superintendent of public instruction to be in need of additional help to finance college educations in science and mathematics.

Clarence E. Manion of South Bend, chairman of a special State chamber committee which recommended establishment of the new foundation and also chairman of the official committee named by State school superintendent Wilbur Young to survey needs for science and mathematics scholarships, said instances had been found of existing funds going begging "because students and the sources of financial aid had not been brought together."

The foundation sponsored by the State chamber plans to act as a clearinghouse for information on scholarships and other types of aid available to qualified students, thus permitting parents and students to obtain this information more easily.

"The official survey in Indiana," Mr. Jackson said, "already has proved there is no need for the federally financed scholarships proposed in a bill now in Congress under the phony label of 'defense measure.' The new foundation is designed to plug with Indiana resources the very small gap not filled by current aid programs for outstanding students."

Directors of the new corporation, in addition to the officers, are R. H. McMurtrie of Huntingburg, Fred M. Crapo of Muncie, Floyd A. Hines of Connersville, George C. Carroll of Terre Haute, Paul W. Kerr of Elkhart, Mr. Teetor, and C. Harvey Bradley, E. B. Newill, Harry T. Ice and Mr. Jackson all of Indianapolis.

Other incorporators of the new foundation are Alden P. Chester and James R. Cypher of Kokomo, Charles B. Enlow and John R. Ibach of Evansville, Welby M. Frantz of Terre Haute, Clifford F. Payne of New Castle, Joseph A. Osborn of Marion, F. E. Schouweiler of Fort Wayne and Joseph L. Hanna, George S. Olive and Otis T. Fitzwater all of Indianapolis. All foundation directors and incorporators are members of the board of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce.

AUGUST 6, 1958.

Day letter to:

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
Senator HOMER CAPEHART,
Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
Senator HERMAN TALMADGE,
Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Senator HARRY BYRD,
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE:

I hope that you will vote against the proposed Federal scholarship bill. I am a member of the Indiana State Board of Education and chairman of a special committee that has just completed an 8-month survey of mathematics and science in Indiana schools. Our statewide examination and screening found only 53 qualified high-school graduates who need financial aid in order to go to college next September. All these have now been given the necessary aid from private sources. I am sure that a similar effort would show the same result in every State of the Union. Indiana schools do not need Federal aid and do not want the Federal control that always goes with Federal aid. The Federal budget is now running \$1 billion into the red every month. Surely this is no time to vote another billion for a need that has not been clearly demonstrated. Continued deficit spending is destroying the value of 90 million savings accounts. Please give these millions of people a break. Urge your colleagues to stop the spending, adjourn Congress, and go home.

Cordially,

CLARENCE MANION.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the amendment to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to urge the adoption of the school construction amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to the scholarship bill, S. 4237, now under consideration.

As one of the sponsors of S. 3311, which was designed to provide adequate classroom facilities and a program for necessary teachers, I realize how meager this proposed amendment is. Years of inadequate financial support, added to

the great increase in enrollment in our schools, has created a tremendous shortage of classrooms as well as a shortage of qualified teachers.

The latest calculation of the Office of Education shows that there is a continuing shortage of approximately 140,000 classrooms in the United States. Added to this there is a vast need for additional qualified teachers.

Despite the efforts by States and local communities to build schools and increase teachers' salaries, this national shortage of classrooms and teachers continues and requires emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. President, while we can all agree that education is chiefly a function of the States and local communities, we must not ignore the fact that the Federal Government has a real responsibility to see that every American child has an opportunity to get an adequate education. The great need for this legislation will not disappear until Congress takes action.

The Soviet Union spends twice as much of its national income on education as the United States does. How can this nation match—much less surpass—the Soviet Union if we continue to deny American boys and girls the good fundamental education which they must have at the elementary and high school level in order to become scientists and technicians?

Mr. President, there is no question of doubt that this program is basic to any program for the training of scientists and technicians to meet the threat to our national security.

We held hearings in the education subcommittee on S. 3311, which would provide aid for either schoolroom construction or teacher salaries. The States could divide up the money between those two needs as they saw fit. To evade this responsibility in the face of the admitted conditions established at our hearings and acknowledged throughout the country will constitute a major error in the record of this Congress. We developed in these hearings documentation for a much greater program than is envisioned in the modest proposal now under consideration.

The Office of Education advised me this week that it now costs approximately \$40,000 for construction of a classroom and related facilities. With the shortage of 140,000 classrooms recognized by the administration, this means that approximately \$5.6 billion is required merely to take care of the present shortage.

The amendment now under consideration would provide no more than \$2 billion in Federal funds, over a 2-year period. When supplemented by local funds, the entire amount would not provide for the present need, not to mention future needs.

Furthermore, this amendment would do nothing to provide supplementary income for teachers, many of whom are grossly underpaid and who consequently turn to more remunerative jobs.

This, then, is a modest proposal, an inadequate proposal; but it is a beginning, Mr. President, and I say it is long past time when the Senate should meet

its responsibility to the schoolchildren of America.

Witnesses from the chamber of commerce appearing before our subcommittee admitted, in answer to questions, that their organization has worked for subsidies for various big-business interests. I am for subsidies, too, where they are necessary for our national welfare; but I am for a subsidy also for education, and this Congress has an obligation to act on this matter which we have been sidestepping for years.

What we are seeking to provide by this amendment is far from sufficient to meet the needs established by the hearings, but it is all that we can expect to accomplish at this session of the Congress. In the coming session, the Congress should give priority to this matter in view of the very serious conditions existing in our schools.

Mr. President, I submit that the pending amendment should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the senior Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 minute on the bill. I wish to commend my distinguished senior colleague and former chairman of the committee, for the statement he has made. He has spoken for the full Montana delegation, and the Record should show that his remarks have the endorsement of all members of that delegation.

I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleagues on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee merit our profound thanks for getting this bill to us in such form as to permit action before adjournment.

It would have been a major disservice to the national interest if this Congress had adjourned before giving the country some concrete programs to help revitalize our learning in the sciences and in the humanities.

The Soviet Union confronts us today with an all-out, across-the-board competition. Moscow is determined to reach and overreach this country not only in military strength and in science, but in industrial production, world trade, propaganda, and diplomacy as well.

To meet the total challenge our Nation needs the ablest minds and the most creative skills it can muster—both in the sciences and in the humanities.

Yet for some time this country has frittered away its intellectual assets. We have neglected our schools and our teachers, and we have failed to make adequate provision for higher education and for basic research.

In this respect, the fathers of our country were far more realistic than our generation has been. Washington, Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, and James Madison, and others of our early statesmen, saw clearly that knowledge and the application of science and intelligence

were essential to the fulfillment of the promises of this great continent and to the development of national strength.

The dangers of neglecting learning in the modern world were prophetically stated by Alfred North Whitehead in 1916, in these words:

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute; the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, nor all your wit, nor all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. To-day we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will be pronounced on the uneducated.

Certainly the path we are traveling today leads to the reassessment of the value we, as a people, place on learning. Sputnik was the shock treatment. For the past 10 months this country has been engaged in a great reexamination of the state of American knowledge and education.

In the light of the glaring deficiencies exposed by this national self-appraisal, the bill before us today is a minimum, a beginning.

I am glad that the present bill places special emphasis on science training.

Ten years ago, there was no question where the best scientists in the world could be found—here in the United States. Today, authoritative voices tell us that 10 years from now the best scientists in the world will be found in Russia.

For the first time in our history, we are losing scientific races for discovery that we wanted to win. In one critical scientific project after another our problem is no longer how to stay ahead. It is how to catch up.

We now see that we will fall further and further behind unless steps are taken to bolster our scientific and technical potential.

The national-defense scholarships and loans provided in this bill should encourage and help more of our promising talent to embark on scientific careers. I hope that the proposed number of scholarships—approximately 23,000—will not be reduced. I understand that the President would prefer arrangements for only 10,000 scholarships. I cannot believe that the Senate will go along with this reduction.

Each year about 200,000 American high-school students who could profit by college do not go to college. According to recent studies, as many as 150,000 of these might have gone to college had adequate financial support been offered them.

Even the 23,000 scholarships provided in this bill will only salvage a minute percentage of the able high-school talent now lost to college each year.

I am glad that the pending bill is not exclusively devoted to science, and that it recognizes the need to revitalize certain areas of humanistic studies, particularly the study of foreign languages.

Obviously, it is not enough just to train more scientists to teach the facts and methods and inculcate the attitudes of the laboratory—indispensable as these may be. Science can build us

rockets, but it cannot tell us whether they will go to Moscow or the moon. Science gives us amazing implements to use, but cannot assure us they will be used for the benefit of mankind.

Moreover, in this period of the cold war, we need above all the tools to work effectively with other peoples. Moscow intends, if it can, to inherit the world by drawing more and more people into its orbit. A major part of our task is to hold the free world together and help keep the uncommitted peoples from slipping behind the Iron Curtain. For this undertaking there is no more important skill than an understanding of foreign languages.

Yet, in this area, we are not even assuring ourselves the minimum tools. Compared to the Soviet Union we are doing a fifth-rate job in language training.

For example, Telegu is the language of 33 million people in India who live in an area where communism has made substantial inroads. Yet not six people in this country can read a newspaper in Telegu. Members of a Soviet delegation, however, arriving in India can speak Telegu and read it.

Fifty percent of our entire Foreign Service Corps do not have a speaking knowledge of even one foreign language. Furthermore, our Ambassador in Moscow is the only United States Ambassador in a Communist country who speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned.

The language development projects included in this bill can encourage more intensive study of foreign languages. We must recognize, however, that these projects are only a small start on an adequate language program.

Both public and private efforts to improve and broaden our language studies are too haphazard and disjointed to turn back the rising tide of ignorance in the modern-language field. We need a far-sighted national leadership and direction that will spur and coordinate the many efforts in this field.

There has been a great deal of talk about the need for a greater flow of first-class talent into the sciences and humanities. At last, with this bill, Congress is moving toward a program to give this talent the stimulation and encouragement it deserves.

The central question now is whether we will make the most of these first steps in revitalizing American learning. Or will we lapse back into indifference and let even these first steps falter.

Mr. President, I urge prompt and favorable action on this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] on the bill now under consideration be read by the legislative clerk. I make this request for the reason heretofore given.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am a co-sponsor of S. 4237, the National Defense Education Bill, reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee under the very able chairmanship of my

colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. I take this opportunity to commend the chairman and the members of the committee for bringing to the Senate floor a bill which I consider to be one of the most important with which this body has dealt in this session of Congress. The distinguished Senator from Alabama, under great difficulty, has rendered a great service to the country in bringing before us this bill.

I will support this measure with all the vigor I possess. It is imperative that it be enacted. I would be less than frank, however, if I did not voice the deep concern I feel that this bill does not go far enough in meeting basic needs of our educational system.

Let my remarks be interpreted as being critical of the bill, may I stress that I believe this is an essential step in meeting our immediate needs in the scientific field. It is the first significant measure to come before us this session to help the nation meet the challenge of Soviet scientific achievements.

But my thesis, Mr. President, is that we must recognize that this bill is only a step in the right direction. It is excellent as far as it goes. It does not, however, meet the problem which this body dare not lose sight of, and that is the problem of what we intend to do about the deplorable conditions which exist in our educational system at the primary and secondary levels.

A scholarship program of this nature is good; it is needed; but if we fail to train individuals who are competent to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by such a proposal, it will be of little benefit. So, I maintain, Mr. President, that while this bill may provide the tools to repair the hole in the roof, so to speak, it does nothing to supply the materials needed to repair the shaky foundation, which is basic to the entire structure.

The basic training of our future scientists, engineers, educators, and professionals must be adequate if they are to assume the responsibilities required of them in our social system. This training cannot be adequate so long as we continue to ignore primary education.

There is no dearth of facts pointing to the conclusion that we have not met our obligations in providing assistance to primary and secondary education. It has been estimated conservatively that this Nation has a present shortage of 140,000 classrooms, and there is no possibility that this shortage will diminish in the ensuing years; rather, with our exploding school age population, we can look forward to more critical shortages in the future.

It is anticipated that we will witness this year an enrollment of 35 million students in our primary and secondary schools, and the experts predict this enrollment will increase 10 percent by the year 1965. Mr. President, in my estimation, it is nothing short of sheer folly for the Congress to continue to close its eyes to these facts.

I shall not take more of the Senate's valuable time to further expound on why I feel our position regarding education

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15889

is grim. It is grim for a number of reasons—primarily because we are faced with a grave challenge in this area from the Soviet Union. Members of the Senate know of the accomplishments of the Russians. They were brought to our attention by Sputnik I, and I have no doubt that we now all realize that Sputnik I was not merely a pie in the sky or a bauble.

While there was a great flurry in the Congress, immediately following the announcement of this scientific marvel, to get on with the business of remedying our educational ills, much time has elapsed and our accomplishments to date add up to nothing.

I recall a statement I made in January of this year, when I expressed the thought that it would be a great tragedy if we permitted an opportunity to pass without doing something more fundamental for our educational system than adopting a scholarship program merely to provide assistance at the college level.

Mr. President, I will support, for that reason, the amendment offered to this bill by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. His amendment would provide to the States, on a matching basis, \$2 billion over the next 2 years for classroom construction. Adoption of this amendment by the Congress would permit construction throughout the Nation of 105,000 classrooms. This would still be inadequate to meet our present classroom needs, but it would be a beginning. I share Senator McNAMARA's concern about our failure to enact legislation for classroom construction and commend him for making consideration of such an amendment possible. I shall support it, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. If we do not avail ourselves of this opportunity, we may soon regret it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. School buildings are needed if there is to be school education. Just last year, the administration was agreeing with us about the classroom shortage to the extent of giving half-hearted support to a construction bill. Now it has abandoned that program, without, of course, giving any indication that Federal assistance is no longer needed. It did not because it cannot. At the opening of the school year, the Nation required about 200,000 new classrooms to meet new enrollments and replace obsolete buildings. The States are building about 60,000 new classrooms a year, thereby keeping up with new enrollments but making only a small dent in the backlog of construction needs.

I can think of no more worthwhile public-works program than one of school construction. The bill I sponsored last year with Senator CLARK, S. 1134, and the new bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and cosponsored by myself and many others would include school construction among the uses to which the Federal grants could be put. Senator PROXMIER, of Wisconsin, this year joined us as a cosponsor of S. 1134.

To those who still cling to the old notion that Federal assistance would lead to Federal control, I remind them of the history of Federal school construction. A great many people have forgotten that school buildings were among the major projects built by the Federal Government during the depression of the 1930's. In the 1955 report on Federal Aid for School Construction by the Library of Congress, there is contained a summary of the activities of the Public Works Administration and the Works Projects Administration. PWA made its grants to the localities to use for the construction they needed most. From 1933 through 1942, PWA made allotments for 6,687 elementary and secondary schools, costing over \$979 million. Every State of the Union participated in this program. School buildings comprised 40 percent of all non-Federal projects for which PWA made allotments.

Every Senator, in other words, has schools in his State that were built with Federal grants in the 1930's. Can any one of them show where any Federal control of teaching methods or curriculums has resulted? Can anyone point to a single school in this country built with PWA funds and say that it fell under Federal domination because Federal money helped build it?

Then we have WPA schools. The WPA did not make grants to the localities or States, but built its projects directly. Over a period of 8 years, more than 5,900 new school were built, and more than 33,000 others were modernized under WPA, at a cost of \$466,700,000 of the Federal taxpayers' money for school construction.

The Senator from Michigan is not talking about a new program; he is talking about carrying out a program which is well established in the policies of this Nation.

Can any Senator who is opposing Federal aid because of fear of Federal control point to any WPA-constructed school and say that it is now being run or dominated by the Federal Government?

The same record can be shown for Public Law 815, under which Federal money is provided to build schools in the so-called federally impacted areas.

I think the record already made on Federal funds for school construction puts to rest these fears of Federal control of the schools of America.

In fact, I digress to point out that millions of dollars have poured into the States over many, many years for the so-called land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act.

Does any Senator want to tell me that any State college in his State is dominated by the Federal Government because it has been the recipient of great sums of money over the years?

Of course, the answer is that such a charge is nonsense. It is pure nonsense. It is a fear argument. It is a scarecrow that is being built up in the communities of America, with the result that timid politicians too frequently are following this propaganda line, and unwittingly, I am sure, but nevertheless ef-

fectively, denying to American boys and girls the educational opportunities that I think are their heritage.

I have said before, and I repeat this afternoon, we cannot let the educational opportunities of American boys and girls be dependent upon an act of God. The place of birth of an American boy and girl is an act of God.

I take the position that every American boy and girl, wherever born in this country, is deserving of an equal chance for the maximum development of his or her brain potential. That is basic in this whole philosophy that I have been fighting for, along with other wonderful colleagues in the Senate, for decent Federal aid to education for many years past.

Mr. President, we cannot have an educational system without having adequate physical facilities. Certainly teachers are needed. As I shall say in connection with another amendment, I am in support of aid to teachers; but we are confronted also with a need for school buildings. I think we should have the political courage in the Senate of the United States to take back home to the people of our States a Federal aid to education law which will include authorization for the appropriation of a good many millions of dollars—yes; I am willing to say that we can well afford to spend from \$2 billion to \$3 billion—for schools, and can justify it entirely on the ground of defense.

I remind the Senate that a nation can be no stronger than its trained brainpower. We had better make certain that we stop wasting human values by inadequate education facilities for our boys and girls.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I do not think any program is more vitally needed than Federal assistance for school construction. The bill before the Senate represents very long and dedicated effort by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I believe the bill can be strengthened by adding to it the funds which the Senator from Michigan has proposed, to provide for substantial assistance for the construction of needed school buildings throughout the country.

I think anyone who has observed conditions, even in some of the richer States of the Nation, including the States of the Northeast, and who has noted the steady attrition in the number of schoolrooms in comparison with the increasing population, realizes that any effective school assistance program must include not only scholarships and the other assistance provided in the bill, but also some assistance for the development of more schoolrooms for the children.

In most of the communities of the Nation the property tax is already overburdening. The property tax in the city of Boston is now about \$82 a \$1,000. The rate is going up in almost every com-

munity in Massachusetts. In the next couple of years the average rate will be between \$75 and \$80, and may go as high as \$100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. For that reason, again and again we have seen a refusal and a reluctance on the part of the people who live in the cities to approve bond issues, because already the property tax is heavily mortgaged in those areas.

I think the only source of taxation which can make a breakthrough in the area of assistance for schools in the next few years is the Federal tax, which will afford an opportunity to raise the needed funds for school construction.

I think it is important, as we face up to the problem of education, to consider also funds for school construction. I believe it is of vital importance to the national defense and also of vital importance to the maintenance of democracy. Democracy involves the maintenance of the intelligence of our population. I want to make certain that our population will be as intelligent as we can possibly make it. That will involve the providing of adequate schoolrooms, and good teachers at good pay.

I think we shall be taking a step in that direction when we accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which I support.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me—with the understanding that, in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor—in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time, I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield the floor at this time—

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] 20 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a bill which will be remembered as one of the great pieces of legislation of the 85th Congress. All of us are very much indebted to him for his leadership in the field of education, as well as for his leadership in the field of health.

I am convinced that this measure, which provides a comprehensive, statesmanlike approach to the problems presented by the grave educational crisis of our times, will be remembered as one of the historic accomplishments of the senior Senator from Alabama, whose name already is enshrined in millions of hearts as the father of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and all the other members of the committee for the splendid report on Senate bill 4237 and for the drafting of the national defense educational bill—a landmark in American educational history. The bill reported by the committee is, of course, much better than the bill recommended by the administration.

The committee's report is brief and eloquent. It is a document of great importance. I have read it with intense interest; and I strongly support its conclusions.

In only one area of the program provided by the bill do I differ in the slightest with the recommendations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I refer to what I consider to be perhaps the most important title of the bill—title II, providing for 23,000 scholarships annually for outstanding students.

My colleagues may recall that in January, 1957, I proposed legislation which included a proposal for 40,000 scholarships, based on the fact that each year there are between 150,000 and 200,000 gifted young men and women who, because of a lack of financial means, cannot take college training. My proposal was designed to make it possible for at least one-fourth to one-fifth of these fine young men and women to qualify for scholarships. Because of the financial situation of their families, many of these students are in such straitened financial circumstances that they could not even consider applying for long-term, low-interest-rate loans.

I consider the 40,000 scholarships to be a modest number.

Mr. President, the 23,000-scholarships program provided for in the bill as reported by the committee would provide an average of 1 scholarship for each American high school—or about 1½ scholarships per 100 high school graduates.

The cost of providing 23,000 such scholarships is estimated at \$17.5 million. When compared with the cost of building 1 capital ship or 1 squadron of jet bombers or 1 Reserve Forces airbase, this is a tiny amount to be devoted to the search for brilliant young minds.

I propose, Mr. President, that we should have—not an average of 1

such scholarship per high school—but, instead, an average of 2 per high school. This would mean that we should provide in the bill for 46,000 scholarships rather than for the 23,000 presently proposed. Therefore, Mr. President, at the appropriate time I shall submit an amendment which will increase the amount in title II of the bill from \$17.5 million to \$35 million.

Mr. President, I was truly shocked to hear of the action taken last week by the House of Representatives, on a division vote—with very few Members on the floor—to strike all of title II from the House version of the national defense education bill. Thus, the scholarship bill was left without scholarships. That was an amazing spectacle. First, the President requested, this year, the passage of a bill which called for only 10,000 scholarships—a number so small as to amount to little more than a token gesture in the direction of an effective scholarship program. Then members of his own party—in fact, members of his own wing of the Republican Party—have the audacity to say that it would weaken the fiber of American youth to permit them to receive scholarships, rather than loans.

In the debate on the amendment which struck the scholarship provision from the House bill, it was brought out that the author of that unfortunate amendment had himself, in the 83d Congress, proposed successfully a scholarship bill for students of Korean or Nationalist Chinese background.

By the way, Mr. President, that is commendable; but if it is commendable for students of Korean and students of National Chinese background, certainly it is also commendable for American citizens.

It takes a curious twist of logic, Mr. President, to justify a scholarship program for Chinese and Korean youth—and I favor such a program—and at the same time to argue that similar scholarships would weaken the fiber of American youth. Such an argument is sheer sophistry.

The loan program provided in title III of the bill is a splendid program which will provide needed opportunities to many students with fine minds, particularly students who are what we call late starters, who do not receive the spark of intellectual stimulus until somewhat later than many others. Perhaps the schools they attended were somewhat inferior, and therefore did not give them sufficient preparation to enable them to become eligible to receive scholarships. I am particularly pleased to find that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare retained my proposal, of early 1957, to permit graduates who enter the teaching professions to write off, at the rate of 20 percent a year, their loans under title III of the bill. Thus, in 5 years, no debt would be remaining. I firmly believe this provision will greatly strengthen the numbers and the quality of our elementary and secondary schoolteachers, who are, indeed, the foundation of our educational system.

The scholarship provision in title II, however, is essentially an incentive program. Within the educational system of

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15391

our country, it can act as a catalyst to accelerate the improvement of teaching standards; the provision of better equipment for teaching in the sciences, mathematics and languages; and more intensive participation by parents in their children's educational careers.

I view this program, Mr. President, as a stimulus to the raising of scholastic standards throughout the United States.

I believe that in our consideration of the scholarship program, we should have at least that point in mind; namely, that it will tend to stimulate greater national interest in the entire educational structure of the Nation, and also will promote the educational advancement of brilliant students who have graduated from the secondary schools.

I am very much pleased that the committee has provided that the first \$500 of the scholarship shall be awarded solely on the basis of merit. A scholarship not only is a monetary award, but also, is an award of prestige, honor, and recognition.

How wonderful it is that, at long last, in America the Government wishes to honor the intelligence and intellectual competence, and proposes to do so by means of scholarships made available by the Congress of the United States.

The students who win scholarships, the parents of those students, and the high schools and the communities will share in the pride of achievement.

Mr. President, I consider the scholarship provision to be the peak of the pyramid or the keystone in the arch of educational excellence which we are trying to build today. The whole objective of the national defense education bill, so far as I am concerned, is to provide every opportunity for gifted American students to develop their talents to the very fullest, and eventually to participate in the leadership of our Nation in every area—in business, in Government, in the professions, in every field of effort in our society.

Mr. President, if we make it possible for even 1 or 2 creative individuals of the first rank to rise from obscurity and to take the place of the Einsteins, the Fermis, the Roosevelts, the Salks, the investment the Nation is making through this bill will be eminently worthwhile. Such trained intellects are priceless. There is simply no monetary value that can be assigned to them. All that we can know is that the investment in education which this bill constitutes is a tiny fraction of the value of uncovering and encouraging the gifted leaders of the next generation.

To conclude, Mr. President, I strongly support the National Defense Education bill. It is one of the great pieces of legislation of the 85th Congress. Yet, it is saddening that a failure on the part of the administration to request a program for Federal aid for school construction was not received in this session of Congress.

Federal aid for school construction was not included in the National Defense Education bill, I feel sure, because of the feeling that its inclusion would jeopardize the passage of the entire bill.

Nevertheless, I have joined in the sponsorship of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which would provide a school construction program. I believe his amendment represents a minimum requirement, but is a most constructive approach to the problem. I have consistently fought for the program of Federal assistance for school construction.

It was my privilege to sit in the very first hearing on Federal aid to school construction, in 1949. As a result of those hearings, there was enacted into a law a bill to provide Federal assistance for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities. Under that bill, millions of dollars were made available for school construction. I cite the record to prove that there has not been one instance of Federal interference or control, but there have been examples of fine schools constructed for growing communities.

It was a bitter disappointment that the bill passed last year was defeated in the House, due to a lack of administration effort and the usual opposition. Doubtless the administration's timidity and other circumstances will again make impossible a school construction bill during this session. Nevertheless, I feel that the record should be clear, that school construction is a prime objective—of equal importance, but not more important than the provisions of the National Defense education bill. We need both bills, and while we are on the very threshold of achieving one great effort in education, we should not permit it to be said that the Congress, like the administration, did not consider Federal aid for school construction sufficiently important for consideration on the Senate floor during this session of Congress.

I wish to join and be associated with other Senators who have expressed commendation of the Senator from Michigan in his effort to bring forth a school construction assistance program as a fundamental part of the bill. Earlier today I commended the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the fine record which has been established in bringing this bill out of committee.

When one reviews the testimony, comprising 1602 pages, on the necessity for a science education national defense bill, there is no doubt about the necessity for such a program.

By the way, every important military official of our Government has testified in favor of the bill. Every important general and admiral, including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified in favor of it. The Secretary of Defense has testified for the National Defense Education bill. I had been in telephonic communication with the Department of Defense prior to my presentation today. I can say for the Record that the Secretary of Defense considers the program embodied in the National Defense Education Act to be as vital to the national security as any discovery which could be made in the field of science or any amount of military power

Congress could mobilize through authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have several questions to ask the distinguished Senator. I know he is well informed on this matter. I have no disagreement with his general conclusion. First, the bill and the amendment are only authorizations? Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. That means there would be no money available under the bill unless appropriations were made next year. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senate could pass the bill this week—and I think it can pass it tonight—inasmuch as a similar bill has passed the House, the bill would have to go to conference, because, as I understand, the House struck out the scholarship provision. Because both Houses realize the urgency of the matter, I believe the national defense education bill can be enacted this week. Next week I am sure at least the preliminary appropriations necessary to put the program into effect could be provided. That is my personal opinion. I have the feeling that the leadership of both Houses of Congress, those responsible for both authorizations and appropriations, want to see this program underway, and I believe they will get it underway.

Mr. WILEY. I have no dispute with that conclusion. The only point I wanted to make, and I think the Senator has answered my question, is that this is an authorization. Unless appropriations were provided this week, or in succeeding weeks of this session, for a part or all of the bill, the money would not be available. What I have in mind is that the people of the country, particularly those who are very much in favor of the program, must realize the situation, so that in the event appropriations are not provided they will not feel something has been done which is not correct. Merely providing an authorization does not mean the appropriate committee will provide \$3 billion in appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct in that statement, even though I must say that if the authorization bill is enacted, I am sure the Members of Congress will find it within their means, hearts, and time to do something to get the program underway, at least on a minimum standard.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is right, that the majority of Congress wants a part of the program. The House has indicated it did not want a certain part of it. The significance of the matter is that this bill is an authorization bill, and unless an appropriation can be obtained, there will not be a fulfillment of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, a while ago I mentioned that every important military officer testified in favor of the bill. I should like to make it quite clear that not only military officers testified in favor of the bill, but great scientists, im-

portant educators, civic leaders, and persons in all walks of life appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—indeed, before other committees of Congress—urging the enactment of this bill.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate that on February 3, 1958, Gen. Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified on the bill. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] asked General Twining this question:

Do you think that a substantial effort directed to increasing the quality of our educational system would tend to improve our military posture relative to the Soviet Union?

General Twining, our No. 1 military officer, replied:

I think that is probably the most important thing this country can do.

That was not a conditional answer; it was an unqualified statement.

General Twining went on to say:

I started a campaign a couple of years ago to say in every speech I made something to the effect that we must get our schools on a better standard.

Without taking the time of the Senate unduly, I may say there are more than 2 pages of testimony by the distinguished general of the Air Force, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, if we would go to the teachers of America, if we would go to the school boards of America, if we would go to the civic leaders of America, we would find they have been pleading for this program for months. What was once merely an issue to be discussed in Congress and what was once merely a desire on the part of the American people to improve their schools is now a national imperative. This is a matter of the utmost urgency. This has become an emergency rather than simply a subject for legislative debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the committee report on the proposed legislation was published it contained my views in 3 short paragraphs on page 55. I stated:

This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb:

If the camel once get his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow.

If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.

Mr. President, one of the greatest myths current in this country is the supposition that our primary education

system is being starved, or at least that the Federal Government or the public has been stingy or neglectful in supporting the education of our children, and that our educational system is badly undernourished.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that the American people are willing to pay for good schools and schooling, and they have paid well for them for many years. They have paid for better schooling than their children have received in many instances.

The distorted picture which some groups have inflicted upon the people has been demolished by a survey which the magazine National Review, of July 5, 1958, terms "the hottest thing on the subject in years." This survey—a copy of which I hold in my hand in book form—is by the well-known authority, Roger A. Freeman. This book, crammed with facts and facts alone, is entitled "School Needs in the Decade Ahead."

For the benefit of my colleagues, I have a number of copies of this book. I shall be glad to make them available to Senators.

Every argument registered on behalf of Federal aid to education is diluted or wiped out by this carefully documented report.

This report was published by the Institute for Social Science Research. It has no ax to grind insofar as I have been able to determine. The author of this book is now a vice president of the Institute; formerly he was with the White House Conference on Education. The facts displayed in this book blow sky high the whole case of the Rockefeller Brothers' Fund and other proponents of vastly greater school expenditures on the Federal level. For example:

Public-school enrollment increased 116 percent from 1900 to 1957. National income increased almost 25 times in this period. But school costs went up 60 times—6,000 percent while enrollment was a little more than doubling.

Nothing that the advocates of far heavier school spending can say will effectively obliterate these facts.

It can be said in another way: Consider population increase, school enrollment gain, and allow for inflation, and this book points out that per capita spending for schools has multiplied 9 times since 1900.

And the share of national income that has gone into schools has multiplied nearly four times.

You can consider a shorter period of time for example. From 1930 to 1956 school expenditures went up 200 percent on the basis of dollars of constant value. Now, while these expenditures were going up 200 percent, enrollment went up only 21.3 percent and the national population increased 36.5 percent.

We can even take as an example the figures for recent years. Between 1952 and 1956 total expenditures by Federal, State, and local government for education increased 48 percent, but expenditures for all other purposes rose only 4 percent.

Far from being starved, it seems to me that facts show that education appears

to be the best provided for function of government, with the possible exception of national defense.

It is, in fact, as the survey says, "in terms of cost—\$14.2 billion in 1956—the largest public service in the United States next to national defense. It roughly equals the sum of the next two largest items of public expenditures."

The increase in the cost of education in the 4 years, 1952-56, equals more than half the increase in all public expenditures, including national defense.

This factual book—and, Mr. President, I obtained several extra copies this morning and would be quite willing to give one of these copies to any Senator who would like to have it—demolishes with facts the claims of those who would turn our educational system over to the whims of a centralized government.

Here is one example dealing with classroom shortage:

Remember Adlai Stevenson's assertion in 1956 that we were almost 500,000 classrooms short and falling behind at the rate of 50,000 a year?

The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported last fall a shortage of only 140,000 classrooms and all figures point, as this book states, to the fact that most States are constructing classrooms at a current rate which, if maintained over the next 12 years, is adequate.

With respect to the highly publicized story about the shortage of teachers, just what are the facts? New, certified teachers in the public schools in 1956-57 equaled one-half of all college graduates, not one-fifth as some sources have claimed. The statistical record, facts and charts contained in this book, clearly shows that a continuation of the present trend will produce a surplus of teachers.

We now come to the question of sizes of classrooms: Official figures cited in this book show that in 1956 the ratio of teachers to pupils was 1 to 25.6 and steadily decreasing. In 1900, the ratio was 1 to 35.6 pupils and in 1930, it was 1 to 29.2. One of the most illuminating facts that I have discovered deals with the claims that pupils do better in small classes. This report furnishes substantial evidence contained in research studies showing the amazing fact that better than 2 to 1 pupil achievement is higher in large than in small classes.

How does all this compare to the Russian system? We frequently hear these days that Russia is doing better by its youth than the United States. Figures show that in 1956 the United States spent \$103.94 per capita on education. Russia spent \$34.17. I am well aware, Mr. President, that there have been some other studies—particularly one by UNESCO—but these studies valued the Russian ruble at the outrageous, fictitious rate of 25 cents.

Last year, when the first Russian Sputnik went up, this country, in typical fashion, became frantic and looked to the Federal Government for the solution of all our problems, including the loss created in the education system by reason of the family not taking its proper place. At that time we were told that

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15893

Sputnik might destroy the United States and the free world. If we are to become so fearful, so frightened, so timid about our own ability to educate our children at the local level, the Russian Sputnik has been far more successful than even the Russians hoped it would be—not in its military possibilities or material possibilities against the free world, but because it is beginning to frighten us—and has already frightened us—into spending more money than we have ever spent in peacetime, much of it on unneeded items, such as the proposal we are discussing tonight which, in its present form, would cost more than \$1 billion.

The Rockefeller report said that this country should "at least double financial support to schools in the next 10 years." This would require, according to the facts contained in this report, either an additional 3 percent sales tax in all States, or, double State and corporate income taxes in all States, or a two-thirds boost in property taxes, or a 20 percent hike in Federal income-tax rates, or the raising of the Federal corporation tax rate from the present 52 percent to 66 percent.

I ask, if legislation were proposed today on this floor to increase Federal income taxes by 20 percent, would not nearly everyone of us, almost to the last man, say that this was fantastic? So what is the solution? This study suggests the dropping of such courses as "marriage and family relationship, child development, grooming, junior home-making for boys, teenage problems, beauty care, date behavior, consumer buying, stage craft, square dancing, pep club, and fly casting."

I know that this is the worst thing in the world a parent could say, but I agree with the survey, which suggests dropping these courses. As the father of four children, and a taxpayer, I could add to that list, but I wholeheartedly agree with the report.

The report has the audacity to say that our teachers and school facilities could be more effectively used. Again, as a father and a taxpayer, I think we can consider changing the school year from 9 months to 12 months. I think we could still get effective education if we did so. I do not think we need chrome-plated swimming pools or cafeterias in our schools. I think possibly we need a little more reading, writing, and arithmetic, with an occasional whack with a leather strap, if we are to get back to the old days of education.

The report points out that more use can be made of television films and technological methods. Then, "school funds will not need to rise much beyond the growth rate of the national income."

It seems to me that some of those who want to increase education costs inordinately may have been doing some stringent and effective propaganda work.

I believe that is exactly what it is. During the first 2 years of my service in the Senate, I was a member of the Subcommittee on Education, and I heard testimony about the need for Federal aid to education. I did not hear anything then, I have not heard anything since,

to convince me that the Federal Government should put another one of its meddling fingers into the affairs of the States by sticking it into the educational system, a responsibility of the States.

Mr. President, I should like to paraphrase some interesting testimony taken this year. The remarks were made by John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corp., given on March 20, 1958, before the House Committee on Education and Labor. He testified:

"In our country, higher education is widely available, more widely so than in any other country in the world. It is still the responsibility of the individual. We require education through certain age limits, but higher education we look upon as a privilege. We make it available, but the individual must want it, seek it and usually spend some money to get it. Scholarship programs are frequently intended to remedy the loss of talent, to encourage and make it possible for able students to go to college." S. 4237 proposed has this as a purpose. Here we can consider some facts.

1. According to the Office of Education over one-half of our high school graduates are continuing their education and almost all of the most brilliant students are going to college.

"If we select, State by State, prorated by population, the best 10,000 students by the usual techniques, how many are not already college bound?"

Dr. Stalnaker further stated that in the national merit scholarship program last year some 15,000 students were identified. Samples were checked since that time to determine how many of these students were not in college. It was found:

Of the top 7,500 students, drawn from each State in proportion to population (just as both bills propose) we find about 97 percent in college. Of the next 7,500, about 95 percent are in college.

He said:

Thus without a Federal scholarship program, more of these students are going to college—well over 90 percent. Of those not going, only a fraction can be hoped to be changed by a Federal scholarship program.

Dr. Stalnaker then made the point that the type of legislation we are considering here proposes scholarship help. What is the purpose of the Federal scholarship program? Is it to make a college education available for able youth who could not otherwise attend college? If so, then it will fail for it will have, I predict, as a main effect, the concentration of able students in a relatively few of our more expensive colleges and making it possible for high-tuition colleges to raise their tuitions higher. It will discourage State and private scholarship programs and sharply decrease private efforts. When the Federal Government takes over, private sources yield.

Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, of the University of Chicago, using figures from a study by the Educational Testing Service, estimated that three-fourths of the males and three-fifths of the females in the upper quartile of ability of last year's high-school graduates entered college. He further estimated that those able to go who did not go to college failed to

do so either because of lack of motivation or because—for boys, they preferred to enter some trade or vocation or the armed service; or for girls, they preferred early marriage.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement prepared by the American Farm Bureau Federation, bringing out some of the facts to which I have already alluded, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY ON FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, PRESENTED BY JOHN C. LYNN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, APRIL 2, 1958, BEFORE THE HOUSE GENERAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The 1958 policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation on general education, adopted by the voting delegates of the member State farm bureaus, is as follows:

"We maintain that the control, administration, and financing of our public school system must remain identified with the smallest unit of government capable of satisfactory performance.

"We oppose expanded Federal aid to education. Adequate Federal assistance for school districts experiencing severe financial burdens resulting from Federal projects should be on a grant-in-aid basis. * * *

The advent of the sputnik age has focused new attention on the status of our public school system. A number of people have cited many weaknesses and many cures. One of the cures advocated is a new and expanded program of Federal aid to general education. These schemes include many things but mainly are directed toward Federal grants, aids, and scholarships. * * *

Is there a need for a program of Federal scholarships, both at the undergraduate and graduate level? We do not believe there is. * * *

The spectacular increase in our college and university enrollment has justified been called a revolution in American education.

A few figures may illustrate what has happened:

Resident college and university enrollment in the United States

1899-1900-----	237, 592
1920-30-----	1, 100, 737
1957-58-----	3, 450, 000

Source: 1899-1900 and 1929-30: U. S. Office of Education, Statistics of Higher Education, 1953-54, p. 7. 1957-58: U. S. Office of Education, release, Aug. 17, 1957.

Enrollment in higher education has doubled almost four times since the turn of the century; while the population of the United States has slightly more than doubled.

The college-age group (18-21 years) increased 51 percent between 1900 and 1957 (5.9 to 8.9 million).

Enrollment in colleges, as shown above, increased 1,352 percent (multiplied 14½ times).

A comparison between the years 1930 and 1957 may spotlight the dramatic change that has taken place:

The population of the United States increased 48 million; equals +39 percent (123.1 million to 171.2 million).

The college-age group (18-21 years) decreased 100,000; equals -1 percent (9.0 million to 8.9 million).

Enrollment in colleges and universities increased 2.3 million; equals +214 percent (1.1 million to 3.4 million).

In 1900 about 4 out of 100 young people went to college, in 1930 12 did; enrollment in 1957-58 equals 39 percent of the 18 to 21-year age group. Some of the college students are older than 21. It may be estimated that about one-third of our young people now enter college. Two-thirds of those entering continue until graduation.

What about the shortage of engineers cited so frequently?

In a special report *Engineers: Too Many or Too Few?* U. S. News & World Report (January 10, 1958), stated that in talking with leaders of engineering societies, with faculty members of engineering colleges, with industry leaders, and with Government officials there appears "general agreement on this: There is no real shortage of engineers overall. There may be shortages of some specific types of engineers."

The United States Office of Education recently announced (circular 515, December 1957) that engineering enrollment in institutions of higher learning has increased from 165,637 in fall 1951 to 297,077 in fall 1957, an increase of 79 percent in the span of 6 years. At that rate of increase—are we likely to be short of engineers 4 years from now?

At present there is no general shortage of engineers or scientists. While creative and research talent is always in short supply, there is ample evidence that our technically trained manpower supply, if properly and fully utilized, is adequate for both our economic and military needs.

The real question is how we utilize the engineering and scientific talent we have available, not how quickly we develop such talent.

These various programs for expanded Federal aid to general education are indicated to be temporary. Nothing is so permanent as a temporary Federal program. How you would end a program of Federal aid after 4 or 6 years is rather difficult to conceive. We believe the proposals being suggested could eventually lead to a far broader program of Federal aid to education, including such things as Federal aid for teachers' salaries.

A program of expanded Federal aid to general education could certainly involve Federal intervention and control in the operation of our public educational system. Farmers recognize the dangers of too much dependence on the Federal Government. Government aid means Government controls.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, according to a study just released by the College Placement Council July 1958, there was a 4-percent increase this year over last year in engineering graduates. While 93 percent of these graduates of last spring have been placed, according to this study, there has been little or no recruiting scramble to get this spring's graduates.

In a study just completed for the Institute for Social Science Research, a well-documented evaluation of conditions in American schools and the financing of public education was provided.

In summarizing the conclusions of this year-long study, the author, Roger A. Freeman, from whose book I have already quoted, states:

The emerging picture is clear-cut and unequivocal; the American people have loyally and faithfully supported their schools. The record of steeply increasing school revenues is nothing short of spectacular and makes no case for holding revenue funds responsible for any shortcomings in the product of your public school system.

In documenting the various aspects of school progress in school finance in this

country, Mr. Freeman indicates how widely enrollment increases have varied. I might note here that the study reveals that the greatest enrollment increases are occurring most often in those States most able to take care of them. In this category, I include my own State of Arizona where, I am glad to note from the study, expenditures per pupil have more than kept up with enrollment figures. The salaries of teachers have risen slightly faster than the national average in spite of our tremendous enrollment increase, although I am pleased to note also from this study, our extensive classroom construction has been done at classroom costs well below the estimate which the Office of Education made in providing entitlement under Public Law 815.

Mr. President, this new study which the Institute for Social Science Research has done clearly indicates that our American public-school system is better supported than the school systems in any other country and keeps more children in school for more years.

The visual analysis provided in this study, summarized, shows not only that teacher and classroom shortages in our schools have been greatly exaggerated and are rapidly diminishing, but—

1. That the pupil-teacher ratio has been declining constantly even during the recent years of enrollment increases.

2. That, over the past decade, the percentage of college graduates who go into teaching has risen sharply, and the number of certificated teachers in the public schools has increased faster than the labor force.

3. That the number of bachelor and professional degrees in the teacher force has grown consistently.

4. That more persons are leaving non-school jobs than quit teaching to accept private employment.

5. That the teacher cost, of higher costs in education, result from the following factors:

- (a) A decline in the productivity of teachers.

- (b) A proliferation of course offerings and the assumption of noneducational responsibilities by the schools (which the study found to be responsible for the employment of 100,000 additional teachers).

- (c) The change from the subject-centered schools to the child-centered or activity schools, which has caused, among other things, building space required per pupil to increase from 50 to 100 percent during the past 20 or 30 years.

Recognizing that enrollments will and should increase in our schools, this study reveals that State and local school systems are equal to this spending task. Although school expenditures will more than double by 1970, this is requiring States and the communities to utilize more fully all the tax sources available to them.

Two weeks ago, Gov. Harold W. Hanley, Governor of Indiana, wrote to me sending some interesting material. He told me that following the launching of Sputnik I, Indiana began a thorough factfinding study of its educational system, with particular emphasis on science and mathematics courses, enrollments and pupil aptitudes. Every ninth grade student received an identical test and the results were evaluated by professional laboratories. The exceptional in-

dividuals were then asked how many wished to enter college and how many would need financial and scholarship assistance. This is the first State I know of to do this—and the results are most illuminating.

THE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS FOR TALENTED PUPILS

A questionnaire was sent to the 707 high school principals in Indiana asking the following question:

How many students in your school qualify by the way of interest, ability, and aptitude in science and mathematics to perform successful college work; how many do you estimate are unable to attend college because of lack of financial resources?

The replies to this question indicated that there were approximately 2,000 students who had the interest, ability, and aptitude for science and mathematics but lacked the funds needed for higher education.

A 4½-hour comprehensive examination in science, mathematics, English, and social studies was given to all seniors wanting to take the examination. Of the estimated 2,000 qualified pupils who needed aid as reported on the questionnaires, 703 of these pupils took this comprehensive examination and the results were machine scored. There were 199 of the 703 pupils who ranked above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science based on national norms. The 199 pupils were then divided into four categories:

First. Twenty-seven pupils were counted in group I that included all pupils making above the 90 percentile based on national norms in each of the four fields of mathematics, science, English and social studies.

Second. Seventy-three pupils were counted in group II that included all pupils making above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science, and a percentile average of above 90 in the four areas tested.

Third. Ninety-nine pupils were counted in group III that included all pupils ranking above the 90th percentile in mathematics and science but making a percentile rating of 90 or lower in English and social studies.

The committee decided to consider at this time any of those pupils in group III for scholarship aid who had a percentile ranking of 95 or above in mathematics and science. This consideration included 179 of the 199 students. These students were asked concerning their ability to finance their higher education. Twenty-three students did not reply and it was assumed they had financial resources for attending college. Fourteen students stated that they had sufficient to attend a college or university of their own choice for 1 year. Twenty-five students advised the committee that they were going into fields other than mathematics and science in higher education therefore automatically eliminating themselves.

A need formula was applied to the 117 remaining and qualified pupils. This formula has been widely used throughout the United States to determine, first, the financial need necessary and, second, the amount of financial aid required in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15895

Sixty-four students were eliminated by the formula, leaving 53 qualifying for aid. Of the 53 qualifying for financial aid, 37 already had scholarships ranging from \$25 to \$750.

The committee learned that the problem at hand was not to provide scholarships as only 16 were needed and could be taken care of. The problem is providing financial assistance for those already having scholarships in order to guarantee 1 year of college work.

A plan is being devised by the State whereby the 53 needing financial aid in order to complete 1 year of college education may secure that aid providing, of course, they enroll in college this fall and make satisfactory grades.

I now come to the constitutional argument, and I refer to the testimony of Dr. Cyrus W. Anderson, filed April 2, 1958, with the Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Federal aid for schools, for any purpose, is morally and legally wrong because it will lead to Federal control. A 1942 decision of the Supreme Court reads as follows:

It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes (317 U. S., p. 131, decision by Justice Jackson in case of *Wickard v. Filburn*, 1942).

Public education is a matter that should be controlled by the States and localities and not by the Central Government. This is clearly defined in the 10th amendment to the Constitution:

Powers reserved to States: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Nothing could be more clearly worded. The 10th amendment prohibits Congress from interfering in the business of the States, and this certainly would include the public schools. Nowhere in the Constitution is Congress given permission to tax and spend for the Nation's schools.

Our constitutional form of government is endangered by the continuing advance of Federal powers and the usurpation of State and local responsibilities.

If Federal aid to education is imposed, it eventually will achieve the breakdown of constitutional government, remove educational responsibility from parents—where it belongs—and make collectivized captives of our children.

A resolution at the national convention, September 16-19, 1957, of the American Legion states:

Federal aid to education could result in loss of local control and the imposition of propagandized national education such as was experienced in Nazi Germany and now exists in Soviet Russia.

Under the 10th amendment, education is clearly a matter of State jurisdiction. Local boards of education are an integral part of State government; as representatives of that government they govern and conduct our school systems on a purely local basis. They consider the views of the parents and citizens whose children will be affected by decisions that they make. They do not take their orders from Washington. This will all be changed under S. 4237. Although S.

4237 attempts to enunciate a policy which would deprive the Federal Government of the right to control the State education systems, we need only to look at what happened in the vocational educational program to find out what will most surely happen here.

In 1916, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act, which provided financial aid for local vocational educational systems. Prior to passage, the same arguments were advanced by those for it. They proclaimed that safeguards were such that Federal control could never follow; State educators predicted otherwise. Today, in a 108-page book entitled "Administration of Vocational Education," these regulations are voluminously set forth.

In at least five places, S. 4237 requires that the individual States involved must submit State plans which meet the requirements of the Commissioner of Education of the Federal Government. This is true of the scholarship, the loan, the foreign language and equipment subsidies and on guidance and counseling, and an additional State plan must be submitted on the area vocational educational program.

From what has happened in a closely related field, we certainly should be able to see that it will be but a very short time until we have substituted the judgment of Federal bureaucrats for that of our own local citizens who have been largely responsible for the growth of our school systems, causing a 1,352 percent increase in college enrollment from 1900 to 1957.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in the past 25 years Congress, the administrative branch, and the judicial branch have done enough harm to what I consider the keystone of our Constitution—the 10th amendment. I do not like to be a party to what is likely to happen tonight by taking away another of the powers given to the States and never delegated by the States to the Federal Government.

If we continue the trend toward the welfare state, the trend toward centralized government, then some of us—yes, many of us—may be alive to say, "Yes; I was there when that started, and I am sorry I had a part in it."

We have traveled too far down the path of centralized government and the welfare state. We have said too long to the American people, "You cannot do this yourself. Let the people who work on the banks of the Potomac do it."

We have poured in more and more people and more and more billions of dollars to let the people who work on the banks of the Potomac do for the American people those things which the Americans better do for themselves.

To me, this involves not only the question whether we shall continue to do damage to our Constitution, but also whether we shall continue to damage the morale of the people. We need only to read history. We need only to read the histories of the great civilizations and the great governments which have declined and sunk into the morass of low morale to realize what we are coming to.

Anyone who can read the English language and can understand it can determine for himself what we are doing tonight, as we have done for the past 25 years, is to follow exactly in the path of Babylon, in the path of Egypt, and in the path of Rome. Let us read and reread what Gibbon said on the subject of the fall of Rome. First, there was an increase in divorce and the breaking up of family homes. He continued by listing the dependence of the people on the government, followed by the centralizing of the government in the Roman senate. I think what Gibbon said should be reread by every American tonight and tomorrow, so that we can become a little frightened by what Congress and the executive branch are doing. We are putting a Federal crutch under the arms of the people. We are taking away the bootstraps which Americans once grasped firmly and pulled on to make something out of themselves. We are instilling in the American people the desire to rely upon the Federal Government for everything they need and do.

No; I will not be a part of such activity. I do not want to tell my children and grandchildren that I destroyed one more bulwark of our Constitution; that I kicked one more brick from the structure of that great document.

I am a little sick and tired of hearing both political parties in the United States say to the people, "Look to Washington," forgetting that what our forefathers said: "Look to God; look to our flag; Look to ourselves—we can do the job."

If the Federal Government continues to say to the States, "We will build your schools; we will educate your children," how long will it be until the American people will be told, "All is gone. We are a socialized state. Ours is a centralized government?"

We have gone completely around the circle. We have come back to the exact situation which caused our forefathers to leave Europe more than 300 years ago. We have returned to centralized government. We have said to the people of our country, "You have no dignity. The only dignity is in the Federal Government." We have said to Americans, "You have no freedom."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the acting minority leader yield an additional 4 minutes to me from the time on the bill?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 4 minutes more to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in my opinion, we are engaged tonight in the destruction of our constitutional freedom. I have kept quiet long enough about these dangers. I am not very proud of the Republican Party tonight, as I realize it has joined in the chorus started by the Democrats: "Let us federalize the schools." I know that the amount provided is not large. It is proposed to grant a few scholarships. But we are going to throw another billion dollars down the drain for something which has never been proved to be needed. As I said in my minority views,

once the camel gets his nose under the tent, the body will follow. As surely as I am standing on the floor of the Senate if the McNamara amendment is not successful tonight, within the course of 1 year there will be before Congress a bill providing for the construction of schools. I prophesy that in the following Congress bills will be introduced to control education and the schools. That frightens me. Mr. President, I am more frightened about what is going on within the country than I am frightened about what the Russians can do to us. I fear that the action we are taking tonight and the action we have taken thus far this year to create a \$12 billion fiscal deficit will come closer to doing what Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and Communists have said they would do, namely, destroy the American people without fighting us, by destroying our economy, than anything they can do to us materially with bombs, missiles, and aircraft.

If the morale of the American people is destroyed, if the initiative of our young people is destroyed, if the pride and initiative and responsibility of their parents in connection with the education of their children is destroyed, Mr. President, you and I will live to see the day when the American way of life will be no more. I know that the present distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. THURMOND] feels about this matter as I do, and does not want or seek to have the American way of life destroyed any more than I do.

Mr. President, in reading the hearings of the committee on this bill I notice that—as is customary—only excerpts of the testimony of witnesses have been set forth. That is in accordance with the experience which the distinguished occupant of the Chair and I have had.

At this time I read from the testimony presented to the committee by one of the very distinguished educators of the Nation, Dr. Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council:

A second topic to which you have asked me to speak is this: The deficiencies in American education as related to national defense.

This I would say: There is an inadequate number of competent teachers, and there are inadequate opportunities for the continued development of those we have. There is an inadequate local sense of responsibility, and this I would strongly stress for the reason that education is a personal matter.

Later in the hearings, I asked some questions on this subject. I now read from that point of the hearings:

Senator GOLDWATER. Dr. Bronk, I want to join my colleagues in their comments on your presentation. I personally think it is the best I have heard on the subject.

I have just 1 or 2 questions on this subject, and they are rather basic. I was very happy to hear you explain your position on the Federal approach to education. It seems today, when we reach a problem, we are all afraid to face up to it, and our first reaction is, look to the Federal Government for a solution.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

What is wrong with our educational system today? Am I wrong in assuming that we must start at the local school board level and find the answers?

Dr. BRONK. I certainly do not think you are wrong, sir.

Mr. President, cannot the Congress and the executive branch of the Government just once in a generation say to the young people, the middle aged people, and the older people of the Nation, "America got along pretty well without having the Federal Government meddle in the affairs of its citizens, without putting a Federal crutch under every problem, and we are going to see what we can do to have the Nation return to the status of individual strength."

Mr. President, insofar as primary and secondary education are concerned I have greater confidence in the local school board of the community in which I live; and, insofar as higher education is concerned, I have greater confidence in the State universities and colleges and their ability to care for the education of my children, than I have in any presidential appointee whose nomination would be confirmed by the Senate, who would be surrounded by thousands and thousands of bureaucrats, and would be provided with billions upon billions of dollars with which to do the same job.

Mr. President, I intend to vote against the bill. The pending bill can be dressed up in any kind of skin one might wish, but it is still baloney. It is still dangerous to the Nation.

The best thing I can do for my community, my State, and my country, affecting the education of my children and the children of all the other citizens of the United States, is to see to it that Federal aid to education receives a decided setback; and I hope that will be done by the Senate tonight.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence, of a quorum, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to provide Federal aid to States for school construction. In fact, I am a cosponsor of the amendment, along with several other Senators, and I am very glad to be.

Education is the most important problem which confronts the Nation today.

In October 1957, shortly after the Soviets sent their sputnik into space, a distinguished educator, Prof. John L. Dunning, of Columbia University, said that the United States must meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in "this age of technological imperialism" if our strength and progress are to be maintained.

He said:

While the Soviets have already gained their exploitation of this new and awesome age, we have not, because our people, our Government, and our schools, have not yet grasped its full significance.

Mr. President, education is important today not solely because of an emergency in national defense. I believe that, belatedly, we have come to recognize that educational advancement is necessary for our economic growth and for our full intellectual and cultural development, if our country is to fulfill its promise.

In large measure, the challenge must be met by action taken by State local and private school bodies.

Our educational system should have higher standards in curriculums, higher requirements of scholarship, for students, better teachers, and more classrooms.

I support Senate bill 4237. However, the bill can do nothing more, in my opinion, than meet emergency needs.

The pending bill, S. 4237, is designed to select the best students now available—whether in high school or college—for advanced undergraduate and graduate training.

It has been argued today, in opposition to the bill, that the scholarships and fellowships to be made available under the provisions of the bill, will be used for the pursuit of frivolous studies. I firmly believe that it is clear that the intention of the bill is to have the scholarships and fellowships awarded to students because of their superior qualifications, and their serious purpose to study in the fields of science, engineering, languages, and also to study the humanities, basic and prior to all knowledge.

Mr. President, in our deliberations in the committee, we did not limit the scope of the bill to scholarships for science and engineering. We should realize that there must be a return to the study of the humanities if there is to be any advancement in knowledge.

Nevertheless, I believe we must face the fact that the deficiencies of our educational system cannot be met without Federal aid. So if the issue is to be joined on Federal aid, let it be joined on the amendment.

One need is that of classrooms. This need would be met in part by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], which I support. The problem of classroom shortages is not new. We all know that the shortage has not blossomed overnight. We have known for a long time that not enough schools were built during World War II and the Korean war, because of shortages both of manpower and of materials. But we have done little about it.

This fall the opening elementary and secondary school enrollment is estimated to be approximately 33 million students. By 1960 it will be 40 million. It is estimated the 1965 enrollment will swell to 44 million.

Moreover, according to the United States Office of Education, there are today almost 2 million pupils in classrooms in excess of the normal capacity of the classrooms.

Today, according to the Office of Education, the Nation needs 140,000 additional classrooms. One-half are needed merely to take care of the overflow of students, and the other half are needed to replace classrooms no longer fit for children to use.

This crisis is a real one. Former Secretary Marion B. Folsom said that from 59,000 to 65,000 additional classrooms are needed each year simply to keep up with each year's enrollment increases and replacement needs.

The States estimated that they would build about 70,000 classrooms in 1956-57. Actually, in the last year 68,600 were completed. Even if the States had reached their objective, Mr. Folsom points out, the States "would reduce the shortage by only from 4,000 to 10,000 classrooms a year. At this rate, a minimum of 16 years would be required to eliminate the total shortage. The maximum would run all the way to 40 years."

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would provide a program of Federal grants to the States of \$1 billion a year for 2 years, to be divided among the States in the ratio the school population of each State bears to the total school population.

This amendment will provide Federal aid, but it would leave the responsibility to the States.

It is proper that the States and local communities should make the greatest effort; but, even using all the States' resources, the need for classrooms cannot be met. Today more than half, indeed almost two-thirds, of the money used to operate our schools comes from local resources. Local funds, as we all know, rely heavily on property taxes, and property taxes are as high in most States as is possible. There must be some equalization between the States if equality of educational opportunity is to be available for every boy and girl.

Further delay will only increase the seriousness of the alarming classroom shortage. The problem has reached floodtide proportions, and State and local efforts cannot help much longer. It is apparent that only a federally aided program of school construction can meet the need.

A few minutes ago—and I say this with all deference to my friend, the Senator from Arizona, who is not present at the moment—it was said this was a Democratic program. I should like to say that in 1947, when I was for the first time a Member of the Senate, I joined with other Members, under the leadership of a Republican, the late Senator Taft of Ohio, Senator Tobey of New Hampshire, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], all Republicans, as well as Senator Thomas of Utah, in introducing a Fed-

eral-aid bill for our schools. Senator Taft was chief sponsor of that bill, and the bill passed the Senate.

I know that we have become accustomed to quoting Senator Taft on many issues. Perhaps it is not wholly fair to do so, but I should like to read what he said in a speech on the Senate floor on the question of Federal aid to education. The speech was made on March 24, 1948. Senator Taft said:

Four years ago, I opposed the bill on this subject; but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent upon further study, that that was not the fault, necessarily, of the States where they lived, but rather the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way of meeting the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without some Federal assistance, particularly for those States which today are considerably below the average wealth of the United States.

He said further:

It is popular to provide for public works. * * * Public works are nice things; we can see them. But when it comes down to the basic necessities of life and the basic elements of human welfare and human progress, there is nothing more important than education. It does not have the glamour that other things have, but it seems to me we must go forward in the field of education for our people and I know of no way of going forward in that field to any substantial degree without providing some Federal financial assistance.

Finally he said:

I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, classroom deficiency is not the only deficiency in our educational system. As I began my remarks, I said the need of higher standards in curricula in elementary and secondary schools is one of our basic needs. However, that is a matter for local and private educational bodies. I do not know what the Congress can do about it. I hope that the President of the United States may appoint a small commission, made up of outstanding scholars, not to study again the deficiencies of our educational system, but to consult with governors and with heads of State educational bodies, in the at-

tempt to impress upon them the importance of raising the standards of curricula in elementary and secondary schools, and the requirements of scholarships for students.

But the Senate is dealing now with an amendment which would go to one issue, that of Federal aid to provide needed classrooms for the schools of the Nation. I hope very much the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the able Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the proponents of general Federal aid to education have chosen the flag of national defense under which to sail their ship of general Federal aid to education across the Congress and the country. S. 4237 is, in my opinion, not sufficiently adapted to defense needs to be considered a defense bill. I seriously doubt that it will improve our relative position in the fields of science and technology.

This bill contains a variety of programs, and by this variety, apparently attempts to adopt as many of the suggestions offered as is possible, and more by far than is practical.

It contains a scholarship program for college work.

It also contains a student loan program.

In addition to the scholarship program and the student loan program, there is provided a program of national defense fellowships, which is one-half grant, one-half loan.

There are grants for equipment and facilities for the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in primary and secondary schools.

There are institutes for school teachers and counselors.

There is also a separate type of institute for teachers of foreign languages.

The bill provides for Federal participation in the establishment of a counseling program.

It also provides for research and experimentation in teaching by radio, television, and motion picture.

The vocational program has not been forgotten, an additional program hav-

ing been added with an authorization of a \$20 million annual appropriation.

A science information center has been thrown in, too, this latter being in effect a national library of science.

It must be admitted that almost no branch in the field of education has been overlooked for Federal participation by this bill. Obviously, the proponents of this measure have adopted a shotgun approach.

Despite the inclusion in this bill of so many types of programs, and such a variety of approaches, I repeat that this bill will not appreciably contribute to the national defense. Neither the scholarship program nor the student loan program is limited in any way to persons undertaking a course of study considered to be critical to our national defense. Under one of these programs, a participating student might study social welfare work, domestic science, or for that matter, flower arranging. Only those programs designed for the advancement of modern foreign languages are limited to any extent so far as curriculum is concerned.

Even were strict curriculum requirements imposed on these programs, a major deficiency from a national defense standpoint would still exist. In the student loan and fellowship programs, it has been provided that a recipient can repay the loan by serving in the teaching profession. In no other program in this bill is there any requirement that the participant serve in any capacity in the field which the Government has assisted in his training. As far as the language of the bill is concerned, a person, by participating in the scholarship program and the national defense fellowship, might, with financing from the Federal Government, obtain his doctorate in nuclear physics, and upon his graduation enter upon employment with a stock brokerage firm, and never thereafter utilize, in the national defense interest, one iota of his taxpayer-financed scientific training.

For these reasons, the bill under consideration is sadly lacking in provisions which would make it effective from a national defense standpoint.

No State or local study reveals that needs cannot be met at the State and local levels. Federal intervention, in fact, is neither needed nor desired.

How does the administration justify its proposal for intervention in science education, guidance, and scholarships in view of these studies and the findings of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, second report, 1958:

The Committee recommends that private, local, and State sources increase their support of scholarship funds to several times the present amount and number of scholarships. The Committee believes that, insofar as assistance by the Federal Government is concerned, it should not at the present time, in the light of the considerations presented earlier in this chapter, undertake to provide new scholarships (other than work-study) for undergraduate students.

There is no evidence that the American people, State or local school boards or educators in general want the Federal Government to supervise or stand-

ardize education in the United States in the fields of science, guidance or scholarships.

Governors of various States have made statements opposing Federal intervention in education. Among these Governors are: Gov. Price Daniel, of Texas; Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois; Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi; Gov. Milward L. Simpson, of Wyoming; Gov. George Bell Timmerman, of South Carolina; Gov. Albert Chandler, of Kentucky; Gov. James E. Folsom, of Alabama.

Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, wrote on July 22, 1958:

Once started, a system of federalized scholarships would never be terminated. The cost would run into the billions, and institutions now independent or State-supported would become completely subservient to the new bureaucracy in Washington, which would quickly establish its self-perpetuating existence.

Indiana wants no part of such so-called Federal aid, and it needs none. The self-sufficiency, initiative, and enterprise of the American people are national characteristics. Education problems can continue to be handled locally and individually.

Less than 2 weeks ago, Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., on August 4, 1958, in opposing H. R. 13247, said:

Education, historically and legally, is the obligation of the States and their localities and there is no emergency or any other circumstance which would justify the surrender of this responsibility to the Federal Government.

I, therefore, strongly oppose H. R. 13247, which would inject the Federal Government in a new field of Federal aid to education. The Commonwealth of Virginia is instituting a new program of scholarship and loan aid to promising students and for many years has encouraged other scholarship arrangements for the benefit of young men and women of promise, who required assistance beyond their own means in completing their education.

There is no demonstrated need for the proposed Federal scholarships and as has been true in so many other Federal aid programs, this proposal undoubtedly would constitute the beginning of permanent additional expense and burden upon the taxpayers of the country. There is no field or activity which is more important to be retained under local control than education, and I view this suggested legislation as an entering wedge to destroy such control.

I am not ready to concede that there is sufficient justification for the Federal Government to enter into the field of education. If such justification exists, however, Federal participation should be limited to that area best designed to meet the needs of national defense. It would be much better, if national defense requires Federal aid to education, to concentrate on a tremendous student loan program, whereby the opportunity for training would be made more readily available to those who have initiative and talent. Even such a loan program should be limited to students pursuing courses of study in science, mathematics, foreign languages, and other such courses closely and directly related to the national defense. The bill should spell out requirements for participants to utilize their training at least for some minimum period in the national defense interest.

Furthermore, there is, generally speaking, no requirement that the Federal program of student assistance be limited to those persons who actually need help in order to obtain advanced education. The lack of this limitation can only result in a duplication of non-Federal student assistance programs and in assistance to those financially able to pay for their own education.

Except in those fields related directly to the national defense, the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to invade the field of education. Nowhere in the Constitution is the word "education" or any synonym thereof used. The framers of the Constitution wisely recognized that education is a responsibility of the State, the community and the parents. The Constitution declares in the 10th amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

This clearly places education in the realm of State responsibility.

I realize that there are Members of this body, Members of the other House, and those among the general public who would place expediency before adherence to the Constitution. These groups take the position that the Federal Government must move into the field of education since the State and local communities are unable to perform the job adequately. No argument could be more fallacious.

There can be no doubt that the Federal Government, necessitated by spendthrift Congresses such as this, has usurped an overwhelming majority of the tax sources, thereby severely limiting the ability of the States and local communities to provide for those needs which lie within the realm of their responsibilities. This area, in itself, is one to which those concerned with inadequacies of State and local finances might concern themselves. Nevertheless, the individual States and local communities are almost without exception in a more sound and healthier economic condition than the Federal Government. It is astonishing to me, that we could contemplate a national debt of \$280 billion, which must surely go higher, and at the same time point to financial inability on the part of a State or local community. Such a viewpoint is absurd.

While considering relative economic abilities, it should not be overlooked that the Federal Government returns less value per dollar of tax money received than does the State government, just as the State government returns less value per tax dollar received than does the municipal government. In other words, the farther the dollar goes from home, the less value is returned. The tax dollar can be compared to the corn which is taken to the miller for conversion into meal. In each tax dollar we should not forget that the miller also has a toll chute, and the largest toll chute of all is that of the Federal Government.

Another factor so often overlooked or disregarded by the proponents of Federal spending is the fact that regardless of which level of government provides

the service, it is the same individual taxpayers who must foot the bill. The Federal Government comes no closer to being a Santa Claus than does any other government.

The total cost of this bill over a 4-year period is estimated to be between one and one and a half billion dollars. This is exclusive of \$220 million in student loans; \$10 million in loans for science equipment and facilities; and an undetermined amount of loans in the fellowship program. It is obvious that this bill proposes for the Federal Government to continue its practice of exercising leadership with money rather than with ideas.

I realize most fully that there are deficiencies in our national approach to education. I further realize that these deficiencies reflect on the national defense. They concern me most deeply. Unlike the proponents of this bill, however, I am far from convinced that money alone, whether from the Federal, State, or local level, will provide a solution for these deficiencies. This is amply illustrated by the fact that any person of ability, who has a fair degree of ambition and initiative, can today, without Government assistance, obtain the best formal education available in this country. There are innumerable types of financial assistance available to the person with ambition and initiative. For instance, in my own State of South Carolina, there are 88 separate sources of scholarships of which I am aware. Of these, there are 29 colleges which offer scholarships, 7 governmental agencies, 21 business and industrial firms, and 31 civic and fraternal organizations and professional groups. In addition, there are 79 separate sources from which students may obtain educational loans. In addition to scholarship and loan funds which are available, almost every college in my State has available part-time job opportunities for deserving students. I am sure that South Carolina is not unduly exceptional in this regard.

There appear to be two major deficiencies in our educational process, neither of which can be readily or directly improved by the mere expenditure of funds.

The first deficiency is a nebulous one, characterized by an existing state of mind in an overwhelming number of the parents, teachers, and of general public throughout our land. It is the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative. This country was founded upon a system of free enterprise. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country prospered. It prospered because a man could gain in return for his industry and initiative the respect of his fellow man, as well as financial independence. This philosophy of free enterprise, which was and is the backbone of this country, is being replaced by an assumption that the Federal Government can be all things to all men, which is another way of expressing the

underlying philosophy of the welfare State.

If we would encourage from our people an upsurge of initiative, industry, and inventiveness, we must bring a halt to the welfare legislation and programs which invariably encourage indolence in any people subjected to their insatiable influence. The pending bill, with its generous grants and stipends, including travel and dependency allowances, fairly begs an indolent student attitude.

The second major deficiency of our modern educational process lies in the application of what is erroneously called "progressive" education. Actually, this deficiency is inclusive of a number of erroneous concepts which are now being widely applied to the harm of unsuspecting students and the general population of the country.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. I have heard it advanced as an adjunct to this philosophy that environment alone determines the net resulting product in individual attitude and mentality. We must first recognize that we can—and at the State and local level—provide equality of opportunity for formal education. We cannot, however, provide or guarantee an equality of ability or knowledge through education; for the Creator, in His great wisdom, made no two men alike, either physically or mentally. We must, therefore, return to a recognition of individuality in the application of the educational process, rather than attempting to use a common mold for all students.

Another fallacious and destructive practice identified with progressive education is that of stressing methodology at the expense of substance. This, and not the lack of funds, is, in my opinion, primarily responsible for the lack of capable teachers and professional educators. I do not believe it is possible for any person, regardless of how well versed in methods of teaching, to ignite in a student the spark of interest which is vital to true education, unless that person has an intimate knowledge of, and interest in, the substantive subject matter he seeks to teach.

This is one instance in which we might profit from the best in the European educational system. The testimony of Dr. Wernher von Braun is to me most persuasive. Dr. von Braun, testifying before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, said:

Furthermore, I would say that in teachers' training, European schools and universities care very little about methodology, about how people teach. They say if this man is a good mathematician or a good physicist, and if he is really fired up by a message he has to give to his pupils, then you need not train him in how to teach, and what techniques and little tricks to use, because he will do a good job anyway. On the other hand, if there is no fire burning in the man, then he is a poor teacher to begin with, and with no amount of methodology training can you make a good one out of him. So you might as well eliminate him right away.

Progressive education ignores the fact that it is primarily the obligation of the family, the church, and the community to teach, by example and advocacy, the art of human relations. It is the duty of the educator to train the minds of the students in order that they may reason to a sound and logical conclusion by the recognition and assimilation of factual knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dr. von Braun was most persuasive on this point also, and I again quote from his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

With regard to elementary schools, and to some extent also to colleges, there is the question of emphasis on human relations and similar things versus emphasis on just plain intellectual training.

I do not remember that I ever attended any classes in Europe on family life or human relations, or subjects like boy-girl relations at college. We just learned reading, writing, and arithmetic in the lower schools. Later on they taught us technical and scientific subjects, but nothing else.

This whole area of social adjustment of life, which plays such an important role in American education, is given very little attention in Europe.

Discipline is the castoff of progressive education. No amount of money can make up for the failure to teach discipline which must be applied from without in formative years in order that it may be applied from within in mature years.

Progressive education cannot be eliminated by Federal funds. Its elimination can be accomplished only through a reevaluation of our educational purposes and a return to sound principles and courses of instruction. A national leadership, not with money, but in ideas, would be most helpful in this regard. Such leadership, by stressing the parental, local, and State shortcomings and responsibilities, through a constructive and cooperative approach, can do much toward obtaining a reassertion of parental concern and action toward revitalizing the American school system. It is a national problem, but one that is soluble at the local level only.

I reiterate that S. 4237 is not designed to overcome national defense deficiencies in the field of education, which is the only basis upon which a Federal education program could be constitutionally undertaken. There are neither curriculum limitations nor requirements for proper utilization of training for national defense after completion of federally financed education.

Even were the deficiencies of education correctable by the expenditure of funds, the Federal Government is the least economically sound unit to undertake this program; and, in addition, the Federal Government is the most expensive and wasteful of any unit through which the taxpayer's dollar is applied.

If this bill were enacted, with its grants and stipends, more harm by far

would be done through the destruction of individual initiative, than good accomplished from the additional opportunities provided, even though these programs did not overlap existing financial assistance programs, which they do. The real deficiencies of education, occasioned by the growing trend toward welfare statism and the application of progressive education, will have failed of recognition and be pushed into the background of oblivion until these deficiencies are once again seared into our consciousness by a question of survival.

Let no one deceive himself; this is not a defense measure. View it unmasked for what it is—general Federal aid to education, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] said today in response to my inquiry. I admire his frankness in making such a statement. True, the bill has time limits, and the money authorizations could be larger, but it is an entering wedge, and a more general approach is hard to imagine.

Education is one of the few fields in which authority of State and local governments have to date remained comparatively potent. There have been minor Federal inroads before, but the bill will constitute an irreparable breach in the ramparts. There is little Federal control in the bill as proposed; but its ineffectiveness, assured by a fallacious approach, will be the excuse for imposition of Federal regulation by future legislative acts. Experience demonstrates that it is more politically expedient to pile bad legislation on bad legislation, than to resort to the repeal of an unworkable existing program.

Before the measure is voted on, the Senate should realize the dangerous and fallacious philosophy which the bill exemplifies.

Mr. President, I received a telegram today, which I shall read to the Senate.

BISHOPVILLE, S. C., August 12, 1958.
Senator STROM THURMOND,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In spite of strong pressures from Washington education sources, I would like to commend you on your stand on National Defense Education Act of 1958. South Carolina still does not want Federal aid to education, however it may be disguised. Urge your continued efforts to defeat measure.

EDWIN M. CULPEPPER,
President, South Carolina Association
of County Superintendents
of Education.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield time to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. How much time does the Senator from Tennessee desire?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Ten minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 26 minutes; the proponents 47 minutes.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill, I shall speak in its support. First, I congratulate the

Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the committee, and our colleagues on the committee for the leadership they have shown in reporting the bill. I think that no more important legislation has come before the Senate this session than this education bill. I express my gratitude and appreciation to the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the leadership of the Senator from Alabama, for their masterful work in formulating the bill and bringing it before us at this time. I have worked with the Senator from Alabama over the years on this legislation and am gratified to see our efforts coming to fruition now.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have been deeply impressed with the need for all-out efforts to recoup our losses in science and technology to the Soviet Union. There is evidence on every hand that the Soviets are advancing much more rapidly in many of the scientific fields, even though we may be ahead of them generally at present. In a few years, we may find that we are indeed a second-rate nation in terms of the world's material and scientific progress.

But we are not concerned only with maintaining pace with the Soviets; we are more concerned with enhancing the economic and cultural standards of the United States. We want to provide our people with the greatest opportunity for self-advancement, for learning and achievement. Only in that way can we realize the potentialities that are inherent in the freedom we find in America.

It is clear that one does not achieve advancement in science or any other scholarly fields merely by giving more money or new facilities to those who are already engaged in such efforts. The key to progress lies in training young people, by instilling in them a desire to achieve, by rewarding their efforts, by encouraging them at every step of the way to excel in their chosen careers.

The shocking fact is that we have failed our children, by not providing these inducements and by not providing the means by which those who can profit by further education may obtain it. We have seen many of our most able students engage in pursuits—all of which may be honorable—not in the field of education or science, or take positions much below their level of achievement, because they could not afford to continue with their education.

The pending bill is a belated recognition of our past remissness in this field. It is an attempt to restore higher education to the place it should occupy in our society. It calls for a cooperative effort on the part of the States, the private schools, and the Federal Government to develop to the fullest the intellectual potentialities of the young people of the Nation.

Some have said the States should do the job alone. I would be first to advise that this course be followed, if it were feasible. But the fact is that the States and the private schools are unable to do the job completely. I say this, not in criticism of them, but merely in making

an objective statement of the situation. The pending bill merely proposes economic assistance to the States, to aid them in the accomplishment of the job which all agree must be accomplished if the Nation and its people are to play their proper roles in the modern world.

I am particularly impressed by the flexibility and breadth of scope of the bill. There is no one reason why some of our young people do not receive as much education as they should. Some are in financial straits; some have insufficient motivation; some have not been able to complete the courses which would prepare them for higher education. The committee has recognized these facts, and has, in reporting the bill, attempted to have it meet the various educational needs of the Nation.

The combination in the bill of the provisions for scholarships based on merit and the provisions for other assistance based on need is particularly meritorious. Thus, the scholarships will be used as inducements for greater attainments in the secondary schools, and also in recognition of outstanding accomplishments there. That is as it should be. A student should not be required to plead poverty, in order to have his achievements receive proper recognition. The scholarship program will be administered by State commissions which will have complete responsibility for the selection of the students who will receive the awards.

The bill also authorizes a program of loans to students who demonstrate superior capabilities. The evidence clearly shows that the student-loan funds now available at the State level are inadequate. As a result, many deserving students have been unable to attend college.

The bill contains specialized provisions to improve the teaching of mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages. Many of our schools are without the most elementary facilities for scientific education, because of the high cost involved. Obviously, a student's advancement is limited by the training he is able to receive and the use he is able to make of the materials in which he is interested. Other provisions of the bill relate to further training of teachers and graduate students, through institutes and fellowships. Improved guidance, and testing and experimentation with new teaching devices, will result from the grants for these purposes which are made to the States.

I think we realize, Mr. President, that the most precious resource of our country is the younger generation. But our young people need development and refinement, as does any other resource. Too long we have said that those who want to achieve will be able to do so, and that those who do not want to will remain in their uncultivated state. But the evidence is overwhelming to the contrary. We have been ignoring our most precious resource, and thus have been denying our children the right of development, self-expression, and creativity. We have also been saying to the people of the future: "You are not going to have the benefit of maximum develop-

ment, the brains and talent of the present generation."

Mr. President, we can take a long step toward reversing this trend by passing this bill. By injecting a new spirit and a new determination into our educational system, we can keep faith with our young people and with the future of the United States. Our material progress and our spiritual enlightenment depend on it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the bill he has reported, which is the result of very long and exhaustive hearings, in the course of which many eminent Americans testified.

The pending bill is an excellent one, and will provide substantial help to our hard-pressed educational system.

I testified before the committee headed by the eminent Senator from Alabama. Despite the fact that the pending bill is an excellent one, in my judgment it puts the cart before the horse, in terms of the educational needs of the Nation.

In my judgment, the first priority for assistance to our presently inadequate educational system, which is not measuring up to the needs of our growing population and the needs of our time, should be given to increases in the salaries of the teachers.

The second priority should be given to the construction of additional school facilities.

The third priority should be given to the granting of scholarships and loans to students.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for having the courage—even though his proposal was rejected by the committee—to propose, here on the floor, his amendment, which provides for at least some funds with which to help the States construct the badly needed schools.

I realize the reason why the distinguished Senator from Michigan has proposed a school-construction amendment, rather than an amendment to provide for increases in the salaries of the teachers, is that he appreciates that the order of priorities must be considered from a practical point of view; that an amendment to provide for increased salaries for teachers will not have a good chance of adoption; and that if the Congress aids the States in connection with the construction of the needed schools, the States, in turn, will then be able to devote more of their own resources to the payment of larger salaries to the teachers.

Mr. President, today the debate on the bill and on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan has been most interesting. I hope the debate immediately

prior to the taking of the vote will be conducted on a high plane. Let us no longer indulge in the use of clichés. Let us no longer say that Federal aid to education will result in Federal control of education. No sensible man believes that the pending bill contains such provisions. The bill, as reported by the committee, makes clear beyond peradventure of doubt that there can be no Federal control of education at the local and State levels.

Let us no longer say, Mr. President, that any constitutional issue worthy of the name is involved.

I do not believe that more than half a dozen lawyers well versed in the law would argue that Federal aid to education poses a legitimate constitutional question. That point was decided at least as long ago as the administration of Abraham Lincoln, when the Land Grant College Act was placed on the statute books. Since that time, that act has provided massive Federal aid to education.

Mr. President, let us no longer say that the States and the localities are better able to make the needed expenditures for our educational system than is the Federal Government. I do not believe that any Member of the Senate who has made a serious study of the problem believes that to be the case; and in a few minutes, I shall submit some facts in connection with that point.

Mr. President, let us no longer say that the deficiencies of our educational system are not due to any extent to a lack of funds. Those who think a lack of funds does not enter into this situation should talk to the teachers, who, as a group, today are paid less than truck-drivers are paid. Those who think a lack of funds is not important in connection with this problem should talk to the parents of children who attend schools which lack adequate equipment; or to the parents of children who attend school on a part-time schedule, and who thus are not receiving the education to which they are entitled; or they should talk to the more than 1 million American young people who this spring graduated from public high schools or private high schools; and, in particular, they should talk to the 200,000 among these young people of high ability—in the upper 25 or 30 percent of their classes—at least half of whom are not attending college because they lack the necessary funds. In short, they should tell that one to the Marines. No one interested in the educational system of America should listen seriously to that statement.

Mr. President, let us stop saying it is the same individual who foots the bill, whether the taxes are raised on the local or State level, or on the Federal level. We all know that is not so. We all know at the local level it is the property tax, the nongraduated property tax, which raises money for the schools. We all know that at the State level, it is, by and large, the broad base sales tax and the nongraduated income tax which raises the money for State participation in schools. We all know that at the Federal level there is in effect a tax system which, with all its deficiencies—and, Mr.

President, believe me, some of those deficiencies were pointed out on the floor of the Senate last night—still has some mild relationship between the capacity of the taxpayer to pay and the tax which is levied against him.

So, Mr. President, let us not have any more of that kind of talk.

Let us also not convert any disagreement we may have on the subject of progressive education into opposition to the bill. The pending bill has nothing whatever to do, one way or the other, with controversial theories of progressive education. All this bill does, and all the pending amendment does, is to make badly needed money available to hard-pressed schools which are unable to give to the boys and girls of America the kind of first-class education which is needed, not only to meet the Soviet challenge—and I agree that the national defense aspects of this bill are important—but also to permit American civilization to move forward at the pace which the brains of America will make possible if we but give our educational agencies and institutions the money they require.

In short, as we move toward a vote on the amendment and a vote on the bill, let us get away from a dream world replete with obsolete thinking, and determine our votes on the basis of facts and not of fiction.

If this body does so, Mr. President, I am confident it will adopt the amendment, and pass the bill in short order. If we do so, we shall take a long step toward putting our American educational system in shape to meet not only the challenge of the Communist world but the basic needs of American civilization.

Mr. President, I shall not even dignify with a rebuttal argument the contention that America cannot afford this bill. Forty billion dollars for defense, and not one billion dollars to see that American boys and girls get the education to which they are entitled. My distinguished colleagues the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Montana have wrapped that illogical argument with a shroud and have buried it.

Mr. President, let me turn briefly to a few basic facts involving my State. Pennsylvania ranks 11th among the States in expenditures per pupil. We are well above the national average in the index of educational effort. During the past 10 years, Pennsylvania has spent \$1 billion on school construction. Fourteen hundred projects are complete or underway. Yet Pennsylvania is falling behind year after year.

Twenty-five thousand pupils were on half-day session last year. The number is increasing. We need from 36,000 to 40,000 classrooms now or in the foreseeable future to end half-day sessions, allow for growth, replace obsolete buildings or makeshift quarters, and consolidate tiny rural districts.

Do not tell the people of Pennsylvania they are not making an adequate effort to educate their children, because the people of Pennsylvania know better.

Mr. President, why is this the situation? A most competent and discerning reporter from the Pittsburgh Sun-Tele-

15902

graph, James F. McCarthy, made a careful analysis of why we are missing the school bus, why bond issues are being turned down when the money is needed, why the States and localities are not measuring up to the challenge of our time.

I shall not detain my colleagues with an amplification of those brilliant articles, but I ask unanimous consent that three of them may appear at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Sunday, June 29, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—BOND ISSUES TURNED DOWN WHEN THE MONEY IS NEEDED

(By James F. McCarthy)

(On Main Street across America a new problem has arisen to plague the public schools. Digging behind the scenes in American education, the Hearst Headline Service has learned that voters are turning down an increasing number of school bond issues—that we are, in effect, "missing the school bus" in terms of the money needed to keep it running. This is the first of three exclusive articles telling why and examining the meaning of the trend and what's to be done about it.)

In voting booths across the country for the past 2 years Americans have been tightening the purse strings on their public schools.

Hard to believe? Yes, particularly if you passed a new school building going up today and chances are you did. For more schools are going up at present on money authorized 2 or 3 years ago.

But the American voter is now rejecting an increasing number of school bond issues.

In Pittsburgh the need for new schools was reflected most recently in a Sun-Telegraph series on fire hazards in the city schools. The series brought corrective measures, but much of the problem was traceable primarily to antiquated buildings and lack of funds to replace them.

Voters tightened the purse strings on Pittsburgh schools a few years ago when they refused to raise the school district's borrowing authority.

Financial problems for the State government and the school districts themselves combine to make it extremely uncertain that Pennsylvania will be able to build enough new classrooms for an expanding school-age population.

School boards have had to fight hard to win school bond-issue approvals, but a much more serious problem is that fact that many of the State's school districts have reached the limit of their borrowing authority.

Pennsylvania educators recently told the National Education Association:

"Seventy-five to eighty percent of Pennsylvania school districts have insufficient borrowing power to provide themselves with adequate school facilities if the cost of such facilities must be met with general-obligation bonds."

"DEPENDENT UPON STATE

"Without financial assistance from the Commonwealth, the Federal Government, or both, not more than 10 to 15 percent of Pennsylvania's fourth-class school districts can finance, under existing tax limitations, the annual payments made to amortize the cost of new school facilities."

As local school districts look to the State for building aid they become part of a scramble in which there are many more applicants than there is money to go around.

The legislature in 1958 increased the ceiling on the amount of local school building

construction to be financially aided by the State from \$425 million to \$925 million. The new ceiling already has been reached.

The State department of public instruction reports applications on file amounting to \$450 million or \$350 million in excess of the amount available.

School board members in cities and towns across the country were relying upon the vetoed bond issues to build the new schools of 1960 and beyond in the continuing battle to whack at the national shortage of 142,000 classrooms.

DAWN WILL BREAK

Many parents will realize 2 years from now what is happening when their children are attending overcrowded or double sessions long after such conditions were to have been corrected.

The Investment Bankers Association of America has been passing along to the United States Office of Education data which reveals:

The past 2 years have shown approximate 50 percent decrease in the amount of public and elementary school bond issues passed by the voters.

This has happened for two reasons: fewer bond issues are being offered in the first place and more are being rejected when they do reach the voters.

Go back 2 years to July, 1956. From then until February, 1957, American voters rejected only 9 percent of the bond issues placed before them.

MORE VOTE "NO"

The voters began to balk. Rejections increased and in the period from July, 1957, through February 1958, the rejection rate was 30.4 percent.

November, when voters troop to the polls to decide these questions, is a key month in such studies.

In November, 1956, citizens were asked to approve school bond issues totaling \$448,800,000. They passed \$423,500,000, or all but 5.6 percent.

A year later school boards asked public approval of \$231,800,000 in new school bonds and the people said "Yes" on \$148,800,000. The rejection rate had climbed to 35.8 percent.

Why?

Educators think they have found several reasons for the trend. But even the most ardent supporters of more money for schools mix with their reasons a strong note of sympathy for the taxpayers.

COSTS CONSIDERED

Today, more than ever before, voters know what an interest rate means. Interest on a typical district school bond has risen from 2.17 percent in 1951 to 3.22 percent as of March.

Smaller school districts sometimes must market bonds at nearly 4 percent, if at all.

This is expensive debt service and the public knows it.

More voters are also aware that debt service must be met before teacher salaries or any other school expenses.

With the debt service share of the local school budget rising to 25 percent and higher, voters now are translating new bond issues into terms of higher taxes and they don't like it, particularly in a recession.

Reluctance to assume higher property taxes at a time of economic decline is another big reason for more bond issue rejections. Figures bear this out in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and other States hit by heavy unemployment.

DIRECT TAX BLAMED

But perhaps the biggest factors are psychological.

Property owners have watched local and State debt increase by more than 350 percent in the past 11 years. They are paying higher income, sales, and property taxes.

It is the real estate tax, mainstay of public education, that is paid in one big lump sum once or twice a year.

Research has established that most people must save in advance to pay these taxes, dip into savings, or borrow.

In any event, it is the property tax over which the man down the block has most control and the one he is less likely to raise if he can help it.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Monday, July 7, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—BOND REJECTIONS ALARMING

(By James F. McCarthy)

(American voters are turning down an increasing number of school-bond issues. Here, in the second of three articles on this vital behind-the-scenes story in public education, the Hearst Headline Service tells what the trend means, including the reaction of United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick in an exclusive interview—the first since returning from an eye-opening survey of education in Russia).

WASHINGTON.—"A contest has been imposed on us whether we like it or not. Russia has picked us out as her chief rival and has chosen education as the route to world supremacy."

This was United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick speaking.

Like other educators, Derthick is watching uneasily as American voters reject an increasing number of school-bond issues.

We asked his reaction and, naturally enough for one who had just returned from heading a 10-man team of American educators on a month-long survey of Russian education, Derthick interpreted even hometown school finance in terms of world challenge.

First to understand what a trend of school bond issue rejections may mean someday, what will happen to our national school bus if we fail to provide money to keep it running, we must examine the construction job ahead for the public schools.

Dr. Lyman V. Ginger, president of the National Education Association, brought home the facts dramatically in testimony before the House Subcommittee on General Education.

Explosive population growth in the past 11 years has boosted the school group (ages 5 through 17) 40.8 percent or from 28.6 million to 40.2 million. School enrollment will rise another 15.5 percent by 1965.

Even if communities build the 70,500 new classrooms scheduled for completion by this fall, Dr. Ginger insists the classroom shortage will be 132,000.

NEA believes these figures prove the Nation is doing little more than whittling away at the backlog, even on funds from the heavy bond issue approvals of 2 years ago.

This is why Dr. Ginger views any increase in the bond issue rejection rate as alarming. Despite more State school aid, he reminded Congressmen that local bond issues are still the primary source of funds for school construction.

He talked of a time lag of from 2 to 3 years between bond issue approval and the opening of a new school.

Thus, educators view rising bond issue rejections as meaning more years of crowded classes and part-time sessions.

A child in a part-time session loses 2 months training in this course of a school year because of the shortage of material covered. In 12 years of schooling under such conditions he loses 2 years.

Educators have translated the time loss into lost money and manpower—lost money in individual earnings and community prosperity and lost manpower for the military and industry.

LEADERSHIP AT STAKE

Let Derthick tell what a rising rate of bond-issue rejections could mean in larger world struggle terms * * *

Words like "amazement" and "astonishment" are well used, Derthick said, in describing his reaction to what he is convinced is a total Soviet commitment to education. He added:

"Our complacency about providing the resources to train our manpower is disturbing."

He agreed with those who have warned we could lose the contest in 10 or 15 years through complacency and emphasized:

"I'm not talking about a war. I'm talking about the race for world leadership."

FREEDOM IS A PLUS

Basically optimistic about the future for school construction, Derthick pointed to a long American tradition of local and State control of education and said any solution to the problem will have to hinge on having enough people at the local level willing to put the force of their leadership behind the cause of more schools.

He called this an unenforceable obligation which people must assume from their hearts. Derthick is convinced:

"We have a system that will do the job if we improve our poor and neglected schools. Those people over there (in Russia) have a blueprint but we have freedom—freedom to make our system superior if citizens are willing to go all the way."

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Tuesday, July 1, 1958]

WHY WE'RE MISSING THE SCHOOL BUS—
MONEY LACKING, PUBLIC HESITATES TO
RAISE TAXES

(By James F. McCarthy)

(A rising rate of school bond issue rejections is today's top story behind the scenes in public education. In this, the last of three exclusive articles on the grassroots problem of "Why We're Missing the School Bus," the Hearst Headline Service examines solutions to meet the schools' financial plight).

WASHINGTON.—"Give enough people the facts on education and we will solve all our school problems," United States Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick told the Hearst newspapers.

But even with all the facts, taxpayers throughout the land face a difficult choice in deciding the financial future of America's schools.

A rising rate of school bond issue rejection proves this.

What's to be done about it?

Assuming a widespread, deep-rooted citizen desire to improve the public educational plant physically and academically, taxpayers have three basic choices:

They can float more bond issues to build more schools, accepting higher local property tax rates in the process.

Local communities can insist that Federal and State governments free more tax revenue sources for local use; or

The public can force Congress to enact Federal aid for classroom construction, thus shifting some of the school finance load directly to the Federal Government.

Psychologists have suggested the simple device of billing local real estate taxpayers monthly to avoid large annual payments. But there is a substantial body of opinion which holds that the local real-estate tax is just about as high as it can go.

Serious fears of loss of population and industry in the face of higher taxes prompts many communities to think twice before raising either the tax rate or property assessments.

This same fear is voiced by opponents of the President's suggestion that governors

decide which functions and tax sources could better be turned over to the States.

BORROWING CAPACITY EXHAUSTED

Uncle Sam, according to latest estimates, could release to State and local governments new tax sources yielding about \$2 billion a year if State and local governments in turn assumed a proportionately higher share of governmental function.

But local pressures, political and otherwise raise this question: What guaranty is there that State and local governments, once given the new tax sources, would put higher taxes into effect?

Another problem in the school finance picture is the fact that more and more school districts each year exhaust their borrowing capacity.

A specific remedy for the school bond issue problem was advanced by Representative FRANK M. CLARK, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who has introduced a bill which would create a domestic bank with Federal revolving funds.

The bank's functions would be to purchase local school bond issues which communities are unable to market privately at less than 3 percent interest.

AID PLAN GAINS

With the notable exception of the United States Chamber of Commerce, organizations watching the school-construction picture have seized upon the rising rate of bond issue rejections as a crowning argument in favor of Federal aid for classroom construction.

The National Education Association is the principle nonpartisan backer of such a plan. Many in the United States Office of Education feel the same way but they are not saying much about it in public since the administration decision to soft-pedal Federal aid for classroom construction and push Federal science scholarships.

There are many in the national office, however, who see elementary and secondary classroom construction as a more basic need.

WHAT'S YOUR CHOICE?

Public polls in the past 2 years have shown increasing support for such Federal aid.

NEA told Congress:

"The fact is that State and local governments have been making a superb fiscal effort and that they can and should do even more."

"But even with their utmost efforts, their tax sources will simply not suffice to maintain elementary and secondary education at its present level or quality, let alone raise it to the levels of superiority required for the carrying out of urgent national policies directed toward economic growth and world leadership."

These, then, are the remedial choices in the face of declining revenue from school bonds.

Mr. CLARK. Primarily, Mr. President, there are four reasons why the States and the localities cannot measure up to this educational challenge.

First, because of the inadequacy of the property tax.

Second, because of the problem of tax competition, as a result of which industries will desert a State which has high educational standards and go to a State which starves its schools, starves its teachers, starves its children's education. Nobody knows that better than does the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who had the problem of tax competition very much before him, as did the distinguished Governor of Michigan, not too long ago.

The third reason is that State and local governments are under greater fi-

nanacial strain than is the Federal Government. This is demonstrated beyond doubt by the statistics which show that since the war local and State taxation and local and State debt have grown rapidly and drastically while the Federal debt has actually declined and the Federal tax burden in relation to the gross national product has actually become lighter.

Finally, Mr. President, let us admit that there is some absence of will; there are some parents, there are some persons without children who prefer a mediocre school system to voting for a bond issue or for local taxes which are necessary to bring the educational system up to the level which is needed.

For those four reasons, I think any sincere student of the problem will appreciate that America will continue to fall farther and farther behind in the education of her youth unless Federal aid—and massive Federal aid—is brought to bear on this problem.

Our educational problems are growing more serious, not better; they are deepening, not bottoming out. It has been estimated by objective and learned civic groups that our expenditures for education must be doubled in the next decade. This money will not be raised by State and local effort alone. The time for the Federal Government to start forward to meet its share of the total obligation is now, not next year or the year after.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Aid to education is vital to national defense. The brainpower of our youth is surely our most valuable asset.

Before the Senate votes, I again thank my colleagues who have spoken in support of the school construction amendment. I know they feel as deeply as I do that a meaningful program of Federal aid to the States for school construction is vitally needed.

It is especially pleasing to me to see the bipartisan support which the amendment has. Certainly if there is any area which should be completely devoid of partisanship it is the area of education.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Bennett	Butler
Allott	Bible	Byrd
Anderson	Bricker	Capehart
Barrett	Bridges	Carlson
Beall	Bush	Carroll

15904

Case, N. J.	Javits	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Pastore
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clark	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Casper	Jordan	Purtell
Clinton	Kefauver	Revercomb
Curtis	Kennedy	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Knowland	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smathers
Erlen	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Feare	Long	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
Goldwater	Malone	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	Martin, Iowa	Talmadge
Hayden	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Hennings	McClellan	Thye
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Watkins
Hill	McDonough	Wiley
Hoblitzell	Morse	Williams
Hruska	Morton	Yarborough
Humphrey	Mundt	Young
Ives	Murray	
Jackson	Neuberger	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNEL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I feel fairly certain that at this point we are deciding what is probably the most important amendment which will be offered to the education defense bill which is now before us.

I am fully aware of the intentions and purposes of Senators who have offered this amendment. Many of us, myself included, have on one or more occasions offered similar amendments.

At the beginning of this year the President, seeing the great need for education, particularly in the scientific and mathematical fields, recommended this bill, in substance—a bill to increase the emphasis upon education in the United States, to help the teachers develop themselves, and, in general, to raise the educational level.

It was realized that we were falling behind the Soviets in many respects. It is not that we are behind now, but unless we change our situation we shall be very far behind before long.

With respect to the pending amendment, as I say, many of us have offered similar amendments in the past, and such amendments got exactly nowhere.

I think it is a matter of common knowledge that it is impossible to get a school construction bill through the other body, and that the result of adding this amendment to the bill would be sim-

ply to preclude any educational help this year.

It is a hard choice to make, when one realizes the great necessities for school buildings in many areas of the country. But I say to my friends in the Senate that if they want this bill, to gear up the educational processes to the level on which they must be, if we are to compete in this modern world of science, mathematics, and language skills to communicate our thoughts and ideals to other men's minds, we shall have to do something along the lines of this bill. In doing so, we must be fairly certain that it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes allotted to the Senator from Colorado have expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I know there is little chance of the bill being passed if the pending amendment is attached to it. Therefore I believe the issue narrows down to this: No matter what a Senator's ideas or feelings may be with respect to the pending amendment, if he feels that there is a need for educational assistance, and if he believes that there is a need for the pending bill, then, regardless of how much he may favor the amendment, he must vote against it.

Upon that basis I personally shall vote against it, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in opposition to the amendment, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. It is difficult for me to be opposed to it, because since 1952 or 1953, both the Senator from Alabama and I have been working strenuously to have a school construction bill passed, without success. We worked for legislation in the Senate. In the House others were working for the same kind of bill at the same time. The House has repeatedly defeated a school construction bill. This year, when the sputnik caused somewhat of a scare, there was a feeling in all quarters that the center of gravity had changed with respect to a school construction bill. With sputnik, we realized we had to take a new look, and that we had to think in terms of national safety and in terms of training scientists and in terms of building up our training facilities as constructively and as intelligently as we could.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has done a wonderful job with his insistence on keeping the school construction issue before our people and before our committee. He fought strenuously for it. He knows why some of us cannot vote for his amendment.

He knows we are in sympathy with what he is trying to do. He knows, as all of us know, that we have not even

scratched the surface with respect to the overall educational situation.

We are considering a bill which has a chance of being passed, in the light of previous action in the House. Of course, the bill will have to go to conference. Time is short. I do not believe it would be possible to get the bill passed if the pending amendment were added to it, as the Senator from Colorado has said.

I should like to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD that I believe what the Senator from Michigan has done in dramatizing this issue is in agreement with the feeling of practically every member of the committee, with possibly 1 or 2 exceptions.

Both at this session and at previous sessions I introduced, for the administration, school construction bills. I was anxious to move ahead in that field. I do not believe we can add the pending amendment to the bill without destroying any hope of enacting school legislation this year.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and those of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

In 1947, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill, which Senator Taft introduced in the Senate. My State of Kentucky stands probably in as much need of school construction as any other State. However, I feel it would burden the bill if we adopted the pending amendment. Therefore, I intend to vote against it. The sponsors of the amendment have done a great service in keeping the matter before us. However, I believe we would encumber and endanger the passage of the bill if we were to complicate the issue at this time by adding the amendment to the bill.

As I say, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey and the remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. One more parting word of praise for the Senator from Michigan. I hope in the future he will see his hopes realized by the enactment of a school-construction bill. I again must say to him that I regret I cannot vote for his amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, no one honors or appreciates the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his devoted and consistent and persistent efforts in behalf of the cause of education more than does the Senator from Alabama. Surely the cause could have no greater or devoted champion than the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I honor and appreciate him, as I do all the Senators who are associated with him in sponsoring the amendment.

Like the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, I, too, have offered bills for school construction. I have supported them. I have done my best to bring about the passage of legislation for

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15905

school construction. Certainly tonight I would not in any way fail to recognize the need for additional school buildings and more and better classrooms. However, I do not believe we should attach any amendment to the pending bill which would invite the defeat of the bill. I firmly believe that if the pending school-construction amendment were added to the bill, it would be the end of the bill, and there would be no legislation on education passed at this session of Congress.

I have before me a telegram, dated August 12, yesterday, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

The National Education Association and its affiliate units are 100 percent in support of the bill S. 4237 without amendments. This is our official position, and we are making every effort to help you secure its enactment.

The telegram was signed by J. L. McCaskill of the National Education Association.

Mr. President, we know that the National Education Association is a great association of teachers, educators, and school officials. It is an association not only of teachers and educators and school officials in our elementary and secondary schools, but in colleges and other higher institutions of learning as well. The National Education Association, in sending the telegram, has done that which we—Senator SMITH of New Jersey and Senator ALLOTT and others of us on the committee—are doing, namely, recognizing a practical situation, that is, to add the amendment to the bill would be fatal to the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am of the same opinion as my distinguished friend from Alabama. Many of us have worked and supported a school-construction bill. A year ago I voted for such a bill. I, too, feel that we will have to pass such a bill. However, we are faced with the fact that even though the Senate passed a school-construction bill a year ago, we did not succeed in having it enacted. We cannot succeed this year. Therefore, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and I wish to associate myself, also, with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Those Senators, to my knowledge, have been in the forefront of the endeavor to develop a better educational system in this land. They recognize the practical question which confronts us. They understand the practical situation which will result if we vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes. I yield further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Much as we might desire to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, to do so would foreclose the enactment of the scholarship provision and the other beneficial provisions of the bill, because we would then have destroyed the opportunities we are proposing for educational development, as are provided in the committee bill.

Therefore, although I have voted for school construction in the past, I shall have to vote "nay" on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HILL. As a staunch and devoted friend of education, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota recognizes the practical situation. He is trying to do the best he can for the cause of education. He knows he cannot do his best if he votes to attach the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the bill.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Alabama and I have served together for many years on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor Appropriations. At no time would we take a step backward or away from helping to develop the health, education, and welfare of the people. But we are confronted with a practical situation. We know of the action of the House. We know exactly what happened to a school construction bill a year ago. Therefore, we think we had better take a course which will achieve our purpose rather than defeat it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, with the understanding that the time shall be charged against that of the proponents of the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think there is no other Senator who has a higher regard than I have for the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and for the magnificent work he has done in having the bill reported by the committee.

Why is it that he and all our friends on this side of the aisle think that to agree to the amendment will defeat the bill? Are they afraid that the President of the United States, who recommended a \$4 billion program for school construction not so long ago, will veto the bill? Do they think that by passing the bill and taking it to conference with this amendment included, they will have irrevocably destroyed the possibility of the ultimate passage of the bill? After all, many things happen in conference. It might be a wise thing for the Senate to study.

Will the Senator from Alabama enlighten us as to why the adoption of the amendment will have a bad effect on the fate of the bill?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to enlighten the Senator from Pennsylvania. All the Senate has to do is to recall the record. The House of Representatives, 2 years ago, rejected a school-construction bill. The House of Representatives, a year ago, voted down a school-construction bill. This year the House Committee on Education and Labor refused even to report to the House a school-construction bill.

Ever since World War I—all these 40 years—the National Education Association and other organizations representing teachers, educators, and school officials, together with parent-teacher associations, and their friends in Congress, have tried to have an education bill passed. Beginning 40 years ago with what is known as the Sterling-Towner bill, there has been a strong effort to pass an education bill. Many committees and commissions have been established to study education bills.

I recall one commission, which was headed by that very distinguished American citizen, Owen D. Young, chairman of the board of General Electric Co. He and other men of that caliber recommended education bills. So there have been many recommendations. Yet for 40 years not a single education bill ever saw the light of day in the House of Representatives until the passage of this bill by the House at this session of Congress.

Sensors will recall that in the 79th Congress, the Senate passed the so-called Thomas-Hill bill, providing Federal funds for education. That bill went to the House committee, and there it died. The committee refused even to report the bill to the House.

In the next Congress, the 80th Congress, the Senate passed the Taft aid-to-education bill. That bill met the same fate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama allots himself 5 additional minutes.

The Taft bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor, and there it died. The committee refused even to report the bill. The House committees, for 40 years, have failed to report any bill for education. This is the first time in 40 years that an education bill has passed the House of Representatives.

We know of the opposition of the House to school-construction legislation. Why should we now, when we have this opportunity to pass a bill for education, attach an amendment which will mean that another session of Congress will go by without any legislation for education?

The bill before the Senate tonight meets the immediate and direct responsibility of the Federal Government for the defense of the country and the conduct of our foreign affairs. I think all of us will agree that it was this responsibility which was the great motivation for the formation of the Federal Government. We, as Senators of the Federal Government, must meet the responsibility of the Federal Government for the national defense and the conduct of our foreign affairs.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported the bill to the Senate to meet that responsibility. We ask and urge the Senate not to kill the bill by attaching to it the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. Let us pass the bill without that amendment; then, for the first time in 40 years, we will have the legislation which we have long sought.

15906

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Speaking from experience and as a one-time chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I am satisfied that if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is adopted, there will be no bill on education this year.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Vermont is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I have had experience in such matters.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Vermont has served for many years as a distinguished and active member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has had considerable experience as a member of the committees of conference of the Senate and House. He speaks with authority from that experience. He knows whereof he speaks. He is absolutely correct.

Mr. AIKEN. A vote for the amendment will be a vote against education.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the kind remarks he made concerning my feeble efforts. I also thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the other Senators who have been so charitable in their remarks concerning my efforts in behalf of school construction.

But I do not share their feelings that to add my amendment to the scholarship bill would have the effect they think it would. I call attention to the fact that last year the House came within a few votes of passing a school construction bill. I am certain there is much more sentiment this year in the House than there was last year for a Federal aid to school construction bill.

Much has been said about the amendment. I hope every Senator who has taken a stand publicly for Federal aid to education will vote for the amendment. If every Senator will vote according to his conscience, the amendment will carry overwhelmingly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, let me inquire which side the Senator from Arizona is on, in connection with the pending amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, no one but myself knows which side I am on. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my minority views on the bill are, I believe, the shortest ever written in the history of the Senate. In those views, I state the following:

This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb:

If the camel once gets his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow.

If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.

Mr. President, by means of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senate tonight is given a chance to vote to permit the camel to get both his hump and his head under the tent at the same time. The effort to permit the camel to get the rest of his body—and at this time I shall not go into detail, in that connection—under the tent will come next year or the year following.

Mr. President, education at any level cannot be subsidized by the Federal Government without ultimately having Federal-Government control follow, even down to the textbooks used, the qualifications of the teachers, the salaries paid to the teachers, and so forth, and so forth.

Mr. President, I find great difficulty in reaching my decision as to how I shall vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. If I honestly believed that adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would destroy the bill, I would vote for the amendment.

On the other hand, when the time comes to vote on the question of the passage of the bill, I will vote against it, because I will not vote to penalize my State and to penalize my children and my grandchildren, and I will not vote for the downfall of our free Republic, by voting to permit further chiseling at the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator who has control of the time available to Senators who oppose the amendment is willing to yield back the remainder of the time under his control, I shall do likewise.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—30

Beall	Humphrey	Murray
Carroll	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Javits	O'Mahoney
Church	Kefauver	Pastore
Clark	Kenney	Potter
Cooper	Langer	Proxmire
Douglas	Magawson	Revercomb
Fulbright	Mansfield	Snethers
Gore	McNamara	Symington
Hennings	Morse	Yarborough

NAYS—61

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bennett	Hill	Robertson
Bible	Hobblitzell	Russell
Bicker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Bush	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Jordan	Stennis
Carlson	Kerr	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Thurmond
Cotton	Kuchel	Thye
Curtis	Lausche	Watkins
Dworkhak	Long	Wiley
Eastland	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Young
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Frear	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—5

Chavez	Flanders	Payne
Dirksen	Holland	

So the amendment offered by Mr. McNAMARA for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the McNamara amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 13. An act for the relief of Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu;

S. 92. An act for the relief of Robert Karia;

S. 160. An act for the relief of Georgios Ioannou;

S. 228. An act for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Paul Thury;

S. 489. An act for the relief of Mary K. Ryan and William A. Boutwell;

S. 761. An act for the relief of Charles C. and George C. Finn;

MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

15907 & 15908

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15909

private planes were in competition for air space with more than 80,000 military aircraft. The civilian flyers were subject to civil air regulations but the military has largely been exempted from effective traffic control.

The Senate-approved bill would create a unified Federal Aviation Agency headed by a civilian administrator. He would have authority to allocate airspace and enforce rules for both military and civilian aircraft and airfields. He would also develop and operate a common system of air navigation facilities.

The measure now goes to President Eisenhower who is expected to sign it, as he should. The worst that can be said about the bill is that it is long overdue.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 15, 1958]

FOR A SINGLE AIR AGENCY

We agree with Senator MONRONEY, Oklahoma Democrat, that one of the prime necessities of our time is a single Federal agency to regulate and control aviation, both civilian and military. MONRONEY is the chief sponsor of a single-agency bill which came up for debate in the Senate yesterday.

"Only the silent prayer of the men who fly the airways can account for the fact that more Americans have not died in midair collisions," the Oklahoma Senator said yesterday. That is true. Several weeks ago, following several such disasters, reports of hairbreadth escapes from smashups between military and civilian planes were almost daily occurrences.

Under two similar bills now in Congress, a single Federal Aviation Agency, in charge of a civilian administrator, would have authority to allocate airspace and control its use. The Civil Aeronautics Board would remain in existence in the broader setup but its job would be to regulate the economics of the industry on questions of routes and rates.

But the vital need is for a board to have overall power to lay down rules for all air traffic, with the object of eliminating the risks of midair collisions whether in the area of landing fields or on flying courses. Such a single agency should be established by Congress at this session, without fail.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4237), the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments offered on behalf of myself and Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, and McNAMARA, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 16, between lines 3 and 4, to insert a new section as follows:

PAYMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SEC. 208. (a) The Commissioner shall make payments to each institution of higher education in the States on account of the attendance at such institution of each person who has a national defense scholarship. Such payments shall be made at the rate of \$500 per academic year for each academic year or portion thereof of attendance by such person within the duration of such scholarship.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

On page 2, to amend the table of contents by inserting after "Sec. 207. Administrative Expenses of State Commissions," the following:

"Sec. 208. Payments to institutions of higher education."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as should be clear from the individual views I filed on this bill with four of my colleagues on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I believe that S. 4237 falls far short of an adequate education program for America. Even in terms of higher education alone—and the needs in higher education are only a small part of the total need—the bill is not adequate, in my opinion.

It was demonstrated in the hearings held by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee early this spring that the great shortage in trained minds results more from lack of facilities than from any shortage of the raw material of good minds. Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University, a land-grant school in Indiana, testified that the supply of qualified teachers is the No. 1 requirement in higher education. He also called for a greatly expanded program of financial assistance to institutions of higher learning for the expansion of facilities. On page 92 of the hearings, he stated:

In the next decade we know that the number of students who will go on from our high schools into college will double, at least. My own institution, if we continue to take only the percentage we have taken in the postwar years of high-school graduates, has a potential of going to 30,000 students by 1970.

The present enrollment at Purdue is about 13,000.

Under Secretary Perkins of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified that helping finance the student today was only the beginning.

He told the committee:

The second problem that will confront higher education in the not-so-far-distant future is that of the overwhelming number of youngsters born in the postwar years who will soon be presenting themselves to colleges. Then the hardship worked by scholarships on institutions by encouraging more than the normal amount of youngsters to come into college will be very real indeed. Difficult as the situation may be in some colleges, it will be much more desperate in the times that I have indicated that are not so far off.

He fixed this time as "from 3 to 4 years, and it will continue for many years to come. It is variously estimated, but roughly I think the increase in the college population in 1970 will be 70 to 100 percent over what it has been in recent years." That testimony is on page 258 of the hearings.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, a physicist now serving as Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences, classified the needs of our schools as follows:

First of all, our greatest need is for more and better qualified teachers. We need to encourage more of our able young people to choose teaching as a career, to provide superior educational opportunities for them in preparation for teaching, and to enhance the status of the profession and raise salaries commensurate with the services required.

Secondly, our schools, colleges, and universities need more money for facilities and equipment if they are to accommodate the vastly increasing numbers of students.

Thirdly, some additional financial support to needy students should be made available, so that our top students are not prevented from attending college, or university, because of financial hardship.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director of the Scientific Manpower Commission told the committee on page 1,000 of the hearings:

We are not short of students. Our high schools and our colleges have the largest enrollments in history. More youngsters are earning high-school diplomas than ever before, and approximately one-third of them are now entering institutions of higher learning. And more of them are paying their own way than ever before.

In September of 1957, 297,100 students were enrolled in engineering—the highest enrollment on record, not even excluding the GI bulge of 1947-48, when 244,400 engineering students were enrolled. Although precise figures are not available for students of science, the situation in our departments of science is approaching and roughly parallels that in colleges of engineering.

There is need, therefore, to channel more young people into these professional fields, even though we must take appropriate steps to continue the normal and ever-increasing flow. What we do need is to insure that the young people who are entering our institutions of higher learning in greater numbers will not get the second-rate education that Dr. Maul forecasts.

A first-rate education can be guaranteed only if there are facilities, facilities, and finances ample to do the job at the higher educational level, and only if there are teachers at the primary and secondary school levels to give our young people the grounding in basic subjects that makes the difference between success and failure in college.

Important as finances are, the entire solution of the problem of quality and quantity lies in the supply of teachers, well trained, and dedicated to the task of giving the Nation what it needs in manpower for its welfare, progress, and security. Legislation that does not have this as a primary aim will not meet the need of the moment or of the future.

To the extent that the bill that is receiving this committee's serious consideration meets this need and encourages better teaching of basic subjects in our high schools, it has the Scientific Manpower Commission's hearty endorsement.

The reference Dr. Meyerhoff made here was to a study by Ray Maul, research director of the National Education Association.

I especially wish to invite to the attention of the Senate the statement made to the committee by the representatives of the American Council on Education.

15910

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

The Council members include 140 educational organizations and 1,005 institutions, among them nearly all the accredited colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States.

The American Council on Education has often called attention to the need for a Federal scholarship program, and the scholarship bill I introduced last year with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] was in large part worked out by the council. But as was made clear by J. B. Culpeper of the Board of Control of Florida for State Institutions of Higher Learning, the council recognizes that scholarships are only a small part of the need.

Mr. Culpeper's testimony on behalf of the American Council on Education begins on page 399 of the hearings. I shall quote his testimony in a moment, but before I do so I wish to say that if my southern friends in the Senate will study the hearings of the committee I think they will be surprised to note that many a southern educator came before our committee and testified of the need of Federal aid to education and specifically of the kind of relief and aid the amendment I now have pending before the Senate would provide.

Representatives of public institutions, for example, from Arkansas, Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, and other southern States came forward and made the plea, as I and other Senators have been making it in the Senate for many years, for the kind of assistance we are asking for in this amendment and in other amendments we seek to offer to the bill.

I say to the able chairman of my committee that the fact that I stand here on the floor of the Senate and offer this amendment and support other amendments is in no way a reflection upon the great statesmanship the Senator from Alabama has shown and the leadership he has given us on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But it should be understood by Members of the Senate that apparently the Senator from Alabama has taken the position that the bill he is offering is a bill which he thinks has the best hope of passage in the Senate this year. There are those of us on the committee who, first, do not agree with his premise, and second, who take the position that we ought to try to get the best bill possible. We ought to offer amendments to the bill reported by the Senator from Alabama which will give us a well-rounded education bill.

The Senator from Alabama will find us standing shoulder to shoulder with him in support of his loan and scholarship proposals in this bill, and we expect in the future to have him again with us, shoulder to shoulder, as he has been so many times in the past, in support of a much broader educational program, such as that encompassed in the amendments we have offered, including as the school construction amendment just offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and defeated by the Senate.

To go to the testimony of the other southern educators who appeared before the committee, I quote from the testimony of Mr. Culpeper on behalf of the American Council on Education, beginning on page 399 of the hearings:

But the fear that really disturbs us is the prospect that unless drastic action is taken, and taken soon, we shall have in 1970 nearly 2 million high-school graduates ready for higher education for whom no opportunity exists because of lack of classrooms or laboratories for them. * * *

What do we need in order to expand our facilities, including both enlargement of existing institutions and creation of new institutions, in the next decade? The latest estimate of the United States Office of Education, based on the Preliminary Report of the College and University Facilities Survey, 1951-55, is that the cost, on a conservative basis, will be \$18 billion. Accordingly, in order to keep abreast of the most urgent needs, we must spend nearly \$2 billion a year for the next decade.

The survey shows that expenditures for facilities are now averaging only \$750 million a year. If this rate continues, there will be a deficit in needed capital outlay of \$10.5 billion by 1968, meaning that we will have provided accommodations for little more than a third of the 3 million additional students anticipated.

These figures, I point out, do not take into account a new scholarship program which would add additional students to the enrollments already anticipated. Of course, the number of scholarships provided in S. 4237 is meager; it allows for only 23,000, when the American Council on Education figures show that about 100,000 high-school graduates capable of doing college work do not go on to college for lack of financial resources.

That is why I say that the greatest waste in America these days is human waste. The greatest waste in America today is the waste of potential brainpower. It is to our national shame; I think it is a sad reflection on our country that it is possible for United States Senators to stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and quote these unanswerable figures which convict us of such a human waste.

Those of us who are offering these amendments are doing so from a dedicated devotion to the needs of future generations of Americans in respect to providing them with a heritage of education which will make it possible for them, in turn, to strengthen America in the great contest with totalitarianism over the next century.

Yet even if we do not do anything to aid these students, we are still faced with the problem of educating those students who do not need financial assistance—the ones who simply need schools to attend. Therefore, the Council recommended:

That in addition to approving continuation of the housing-loan program on the present basis with additional authorization for funds, the Congress should establish a new program of financial assistance to institutions of higher learning for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their educational objectives. * * * The recommendation is an initial appropriation of \$125 million for grants and \$250 million for loans.

When the question was raised about making grants to private institutions, Dr. Culpeper replied:

There are those who take a different position from that which is supported by the Council. But we have a critical situation here in a need for facilities. If we do not make these grants to the private institutions, so the Council states, then the alter-

nate to providing those facilities would be for public funds from some level to go to construction of new institutions. This would cost more and require longer.

The critical need is to provide the facilities for these 3 million new students out and beyond the present 3 million that we have. We must move as quickly and as judiciously as we can to accommodate these young people of superior capacity.

The president of American University, Dr. Hurst R. Anderson, also testified for the American Council on Education. Dr. Anderson presented the Council proposal that a \$500 grant to the institution accompany each scholarship awarded. That is the basis for the amendment I have offered, which is pending. I quote his testimony on page 408 of the hearings:

Neither the Hill nor the Smith bill makes any substantial provision for the additional costs that must be borne by the colleges by reason of the enrollment of scholarship holders. In our opinion this is a serious omission. Even without a Federal scholarship program it is estimated that the number of college students in this country will double by 1970. How can the institutions provide the facilities, the larger facilities, and the laboratories? The local communities, the States, and private sources have basic responsibility, but anybody who has read the reports on school-bond elections in the last year knows that local sources of finance have strict limitations.

Dr. Anderson continued:

We do not expect you to bail us out wholly, but we do think if the Federal Government wants us to do something about this, at least you ought to help us with the additional students you throw on our shoulders with the scholarship program. We really feel this very strongly. I cannot emphasize this too much * * *. You cannot give (a student) \$2,000 to go to a university when you cannot find a university that can afford to give him an education.

It sounds fine to say to the country, "We propose to provide 23,000 scholarships to students," but it is a disservice to the colleges of America, and it is unfair to them to place upon them the burden of educating those students unless we are willing to make some contribution to the institution which receives students, to help defray the cost of their education, over and above the contribution of the scholarships to their education.

Before I finish, I shall refer to some statistics to point out what that additional cost is. Let me state it from memory now.

By and large, in the State colleges the student's tuition is about 14 percent of the cost to the State, taken through the school year.

In private institutions, by and large, the average tuition fees the student pays covers about 50 percent of the cost to the institution for educating the student. What the college presidents who testified in support of the principle of my amendment said to us in committee—and Dr. Anderson's testimony is very clear and unequivocal on this point, as is the testimony of the other witnesses—was, in effect, that it is not fair or right that we pass a scholarship bill which would place a good many students in the colleges unless we are willing also to make to the institutions a contribution

to the cost of educating the students over and above what the scholarships bring in by way of tuition fees. I believe that is only fair and right.

I now wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the statements made on behalf of the great land-grant colleges and universities. Among the witnesses for these institutions were Dr. John Caldwell, president of the University of Arkansas, and Dr. Russell Thackrey, executive secretary of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges, among others. This association represents 70 colleges and universities, including 68 land-grant institutions, plus Georgia Institute of Technology and the State University of New York. Dr. Caldwell also spoke for the State Universities Association, representing 24 State universities which are not land-grant institutions. Here is what this group told us about education needs:

Both bills (the Hill bill and Smith bill) with some exceptions which I shall mention represent a long-range attack on educational problems, with heavy emphasis on the improvement of science, mathematics, and language instruction in our elementary and secondary schools. Neither piece of legislation, again with 1 or 2 exceptions, contains provisions which will substantially improve our scientific and technological effort and our competitive position in the world in which we live, during the next 10 years. Doctoral-degree candidates of 7 to 10 years from now will come from the class entering college next fall. The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our highly trained leadership over the next decade, and indeed, will always be major factors. * * *

Mr. President, I digress from the quotation long enough to say that these great educators are unanswerably right. With 21 years of college teaching behind me, I say most respectfully that the bill which is sponsored by the Senator from Alabama, myself, and others, barely scratches the surface of America's educational needs of the moment. It does not come anywhere near meeting the real problem which threatens and confronts America in respect to improving education at the elementary and secondary school level.

Scholarships, desirable as they are, are not the whole answer even for the relatively few students who will benefit from them; and the scholarship students will make only a slight dent in America's educational problem. I believe in relying on the experts. I believe in following the experts in matters on which they can speak with authority. Here is the unanswerable testimony of experts. We find it in page after page of the printed hearings. I cite testimony such as the testimony I have just read. I read it again:

The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our high trained leadership over the next decade, and indeed, will always be major factors.

I continue to read:

Our colleges and universities are now in great need of expanded financial support, so that they may attract and retain competent faculties, provide adequate facilities, and keep charges to students low enough that

they do not constitute an insuperable financial barrier to college attendance. One of the most dangerous tendencies in American higher education today in our opinion is the tendency to throw more and more of the cost of education on the students, and, of course, on their families. * * *

This is preliminary, Mr. Chairman, to saying that the members of our two associations are opposed to the inauguration of a Federal scholarship program at this time.

Senators should keep in mind that I am reading from the testimony submitted by great educators in behalf of the land grant colleges and State universities of America. There are land grant colleges in each of the States represented in the Senate.

When the land grant schools of the Nation takes this position, I submit that the Senate of the United States had better stop and take a long look at the pending bill. Our colleges and universities are telling us that it does not do the job. They are the people who know.

First, it would not meet the primary need, which is direct aid to colleges and universities, as I indicated above, for faculties and facilities.

The statements I have quoted from the hearings, are from experts in the field of education. When the representatives of land grant colleges and State universities take this position, we can be certain that they are the persons who know. Listen to the words of the last quotation again:

First, it would not meet the primary need, which is direct aid to colleges and universities, as I indicated above, for faculties and facilities.

The additional reasons given dealt with the issue of whether the scholarships we provided would actually go to students who would not otherwise attend college. In presenting this statement, Dr. Caldwell of the University of Arkansas quoted the recommendations of the American Society for Engineering Education as follows:

The most critical shortage affecting engineering education at the university level is, and will be for the next decade, the shortage of engineering teachers. Of secondary, but critical, importance is the deficiency in laboratory, classroom, and office space. * * * Therefore, unless and until these critical shortages are relieved, programs which aim primarily at increasing the supply of undergraduate engineering students beyond those now in sight are highly questionable. On the other hand, programs to support improvement of their high school preparation in English, mathematics, science, language, and history are most important.

There are provisions in S. 4237 that would be of great help in improving the high school preparation of prospective engineering students.

But, Mr. President, listen to this educator. He said not one word about the need for scholarships. To the contrary, the testimony made it clear that the problem is not one of getting students; it is a problem of getting adequate teaching and adequate facilities. Those are the two primary needs, said this great educator.

One who points this out puts himself in the embarrassing position of seeming to be opposed to a bill before the Senate

which is good so far as it goes. I am not opposed to it. I am among its co-sponsors. I simply take the position that we should do first things first. This is not the first thing we should do. It is rather far down the list, when we consider the needs of American education.

So I urge that if we are to pass the bill—and I shall vote for the scholarships—then we ought to add to the scholarships a \$500 grant to the institution to which the student will go, so that the \$500 can be plowed into the facility needs of the institution; into the teacher needs of the institution, perhaps into the salary budget, to enable the institution to keep some teachers who otherwise would be drained off by industry, because industry is able to pay much higher salaries.

Among the recommendations of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges was this:

We believe that the times call for direct Federal aid in construction of college and university laboratory and classroom facilities, particularly in fields related to science and engineering.

In answer to questions from committee members, Dr. Caldwell made this statement:

The basic premise of this document is that we need improved faculties and facilities in order to do higher quality work in higher education. Putting more students in our hands does not per se do it. As a matter of fact, it puts more load on us. We would like to see more assistance in providing faculty and facilities for just the very purpose that you make here. * * * We say to you: The quality and adequacy of college faculties and facilities are the essential determinative factors of the quality and quantity of our highly trained leadership over the next decade. We are looking for both. This indeed has always been the major factor. The adequacy of faculty, we think, is the determining factor.

I say again to Senators, each one of whom has at least one of these institutions in his State, that this is the testimony of the representatives of those colleges concerning the issue before the Senate. My amendment seeks only to make some contribution to those institutions for faculty and facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Has all my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. MORSE. May I have 5 minutes on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot yield; I have only 5 minutes.

In addition to the experts from the educational institutions who testified, our committee received statements from Senator CASE of New Jersey, Senator CLARK, and Senator HUMPHREY concerning the recognition that must be taken of the Federal responsibility in this area. These Senators all proposed various programs of direct aid to the States or to the institutions for improved facilities or faculties or both.

15912

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

I made my own statement to this effect, and presented the picture that faces my State of Oregon, where enrollments are expected to increase by 58 percent in the next 4 years, irrespective of any Federal scholarship students.

But there is one more reference to the committee hearings I would like to make for the benefit of my colleagues. On page 251 there are set forth the figures showing the percentage of the cost of education that is covered by tuition. The figures from the Office of Education are as follows: For the academic year 1953-54, the most recent year for which complete and comparable institutional data are available, the income from student fees of the privately controlled higher institutions constituted approximately 50 percent of the total educational and general expenditures. In the case of the publicly controlled colleges and universities the comparable ratio was 14 percent.

Where we give the student a scholarship and thereby pay most or all of his tuition, we are only paying half the cost of educating him if he goes to a private school and only 14 percent of the cost if he goes to a public school, on the average.

The average tuition and fees in private institutions in 1957-58 was \$736; and the average tuition and fees in public institutions was \$168. Therefore, I believe a grant of \$500 to each institution for each scholarship student it enrolls is a reasonable rule of thumb to follow. It would still not cover the whole cost of education; but it would go a long way in that direction.

I offered my amendment in the subcommittee, and it was rejected, but not because all my colleagues on the committee disagreed with the principle of my amendment. It is fair to say that a number of my colleagues, including some who voted against my amendment, took the position that they felt the only thing we had any hope of having passed this year was a scholarship and loan bill without anything else attached to it. I stress that point.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have only limited time.

Mr. IVES. I point out only one thing. This proposal costs only \$5 million. That is a very small amount compared with the whole cost. I think the institutions are entitled to it.

Mr. MORSE. The senior Senator from New York has been a great friend to the educational institutions of the country. I am not surprised to have him give me this boost in the closing minute of my statement in support of my amendment.

I call attention to the fact that in S. 4237 we do provide a grant to the institutions for each fellowship student they enroll, a grant that may go as high as \$2,500. The principle of helping the institutions finance the education of scholarship students is just as valid, in my opinion.

My amendment points the way in which the American Nation will have to go in the years ahead. The longer we wait to do the job, the further ahead

of us the Soviet Union is going to get in the science and technology of war. I think it is that simple.

The pending bill does make important contributions to helping improve the supply of teachers. But there is no substitute for adequate salaries in obtaining and keeping good teachers at any level of education.

I favor S. 4237, and I shall vote for it. It is a step in the right direction. But it is only a token, and I shall continue working in the next Congress for the additional Federal program for education that is really needed.

I offer my amendment—and I do so good naturedly, probably hoping against hope—with a plea, yes, with a prayer on my lips that the Senate tonight will rise to its responsibility of being fair to the educational institutions of the country, and that when it passes the scholarship bill, it will also provide for the institutions to which the students will go a contribution which will help to defray a part of the additional burden which those institutions will have to assume in order to carry out the scholarship provisions of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield time to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I seek information: If the Federal Government is to provide the educational institutions with \$500 for each Federal scholarship student in attendance, separate and apart from the scholarship funds which are to be given to the students, I wonder whether such payments by the Federal Government could be made to, let us say, Wilmington College, a Quaker institution; to Wooster College, a Presbyterian institution; to Wesleyan College, a Methodist institution; to Carroll College, a Catholic institution; to Kenyon College, an Episcopalian institution; and to Dennison College, a Baptist institution; without violating the constitutional provision?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, certainly considerable time is needed to discuss this point. Let me say that in my opinion there is no constitutional barrier to the making of such payments. The bill already calls for them to be made to the institutions for each fellowship awarded for graduate study.

I wish the Senate were not now proceeding under a limitation of time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, because I should like to discuss this long-existing prejudice in the Nation which has no basis in constitutional law, namely, that the Federal Government is without power, under the Constitution, to appropriate funds for the education of the students who attend private schools.

As I stated earlier today, in connection with another amendment, such payments have previously been made in the United States, to the extent of great sums of money paid in connection with WPA and the PWA projects, in the case

of the funds for those agencies which were used to help improve educational facilities in the Nation. They have been made to nonpublic schools which are land-grant schools. They have been made to cover the cost of educating servicemen.

Let me restate very quickly my long-standing position which I have taken under considerable criticism in my State, although my State has threshed out, through the courts, the issue of whether tax dollars can be used for the benefit of the students who attend private educational institutions. The famous Oregon cases, which went all the way to the United States Supreme Court, established that point once and for all, in my opinion.

I realize that it can be said that those cases involved State tax funds, rather than Federal tax funds; but I point out that there is no justification for an attempt to draw a line of demarcation between such use of State tax funds and such use of Federal tax funds, insofar as the constitutional law on this point is concerned. The test is whether the benefit goes to the students concerned.

In connection with my amendment, it will be possible to trace directly to the students the benefits which thus will be received by the educational institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, I understand that it is the position of the Senator from Oregon that the proposed \$500 payment for each Federal scholarship student would not go directly to the college the student attended, but would be of benefit to the student himself, just as the scholarship subsidy the student received would be of direct benefit to him, not to the college he attended; and therefore such payments would come within the constitutional provision.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; even though the contribution goes to the educational institution, the court will always be able to pierce the veil and trace the benefit from it directly to the students concerned. In my opinion, that is all that is necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MORSE) has clearly stated that his amendment does not involve payments to particular institutions, but, instead, involves payments for the benefit of the students who attend the institutions, as those payments would be made under a

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15913

formula established by the proposed Federal law.

In this instance, the proposed Federal scholarship will make it possible for such a student to choose a college which is qualified to meet the requirements of the scholarship he has received. On that basis, the student might attend a college which was not a public institution; and in such case, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would require that the particular institution be permitted to receive, because of the attendance of national or Federal scholarship students, and receive in behalf of those students—additional funds, in order to be able to make available to them the necessary facilities.

Let me say that previously I introduced a bill on this subject; and I shall request that the bill be printed in the Record.

I certainly believe the Senator from Oregon is correct; and I wish to associate myself with his endeavor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield time to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I wish to express my complete agreement with the pertinent comment which was made a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I desire to associate myself with his remarks, and also to indicate, for the benefit of my colleagues and for the benefit of the Record, my support of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, with which I am in hearty agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that there may be a quorum call, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes in opposition to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon has stated, this amendment was considered by the subcommittee, and voted down by the subcommittee. It was then considered by the full committee, and was voted down by the full committee. There were several reasons why the amendment was voted down by both the subcommittee and the full committee. One reason was that the amend-

ment would give \$500 to every college and every institution to which a boy or girl would go with a scholarship. A scholarship would go to the boy or girl, and then there would be a grant of \$500 to the college or institution.

The record shows it does not cost \$500 in many institutions for the education of a boy or girl for any particular year. Some of the costs were shown to be as low as \$225 a year, \$239 a year, and \$279 a year. So why should we give such institutions \$500 a year?

The Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, at its 71st annual convention last fall, declared in its resolution that "payments to institutions should cover only additional direct administrative costs incurred as the result of special services or reports involved in the Federal program."

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has quoted from the testimony of Dr. Caldwell, who once was head of one of our colleges in Alabama, and whom we in Alabama hold in the highest esteem. Dr. Caldwell declared that "all payments should be made to the individual students receiving the scholarship rather than to the institution except for sums necessary to meet the administrative cost to the college of any Federally required reports not required for the ordinary student."

Instead of this program costing \$5 million, it would have to bear the cost over 7 years, because a boy or a girl who received a scholarship in the fourth year would be allowed to continue the remaining 3 years. So the period would run for 7 years. Instead of costing \$5 million, the program would cost about \$135 million.

For those reasons, both the subcommittee and the full committee rejected the amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. When I referred to the figure of \$5 million, I was referring to \$5 million a year. I neglected to state the number of scholarships involved, which is 22,000 a year. When the years are added up, the time amounts to 7 years; but even then, the cost would be less than \$20 million for the 7 years, on the average.

Mr. HILL. So many students are admitted in 1 year. The 4-year period goes in effect. The same number are admitted the following year. It is only at the end of the 7th year that the program runs out, because there is a 4-year scholarship period included.

Mr. IVES. But if the amount of \$135 million is divided by 7, it comes to less than \$20 million a year.

Mr. HILL. That is true, but we are talking about the overall cost, which under the bill would be the sum of \$135 million.

Mr. IVES. That is what I am talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the chairman of the committee. The question has been discussed fully. The proposal would result in an additional cost and would not accomplish what we are trying to do. So I wish to identify myself with the views of the chairman of the committee in opposing the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield one-half a minute to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield time on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for one-half a minute.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I am very much impressed with the validity of the argument he has made. I desire to associate myself with him in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—20

Carroll	Jackson	Mansfield
Case, N. J.	Javits	McNamara
Clark	Kefauver	Morse
Douglas	Kuchel	Neuberger
Fulbright	Langer	Pastore
Humphrey	Lausche	Proxmire
Ives	Magnuson	

NAYS—69

Aiken	Frear	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Mundt
Anderson	Core	Potter
Barrett	Green	Purtell
Beall	Hayden	Revercomb
Bennett	Hennings	Robertson
Bible	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoblitze	Schoepel
Bush	Hruska	Smathers
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Carlson	Jordan	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Symington
Church	Kerr	Talmadge
Cooper	Knowland	Thurmond
Cotton	Long	Thye
Curtis	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Ervin	Monroney	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Chavez	Holland	Payne
Dirksen	Murray	
Flanders	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. MORSE for himself and other Senators was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from

15914

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just received a note from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who must leave by plane very shortly. He would like to speak for 5 minutes on the bill. Apparently he will be yielded that time. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, that the time of the Senator from New York will not be counted against me, and that my remarks will be printed in continuity in the Record without showing the interruption by the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOBLITZELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a matter which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. It relates to the bill, but does not have any relation to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The language of the Senate bill differs from the language of the House bill. I have examined the bill very carefully with a view to ascertaining whether there was any likelihood of the administration of the loan provision or the administration of the scholarship provision or of the other features of the bill being intruded with any discrimination on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin.

After examining the bill very carefully, I consulted with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will administer the bill if it is enacted into law.

I should now like to read into the Record a letter which I believe very clearly covers the subject, and makes very plain that the program will be administered in the same spirit as the GI bill of rights program and other programs which represent expenditures of national funds, and therefore should have no trace whatever of discrimination connected with it. I read the letter, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, August 13, 1958.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This relates to the inquiry by a member of your staff regarding two provisions in H. R. 13247 (the proposed National Defense Education Act of 1958), as enacted by the House of Representatives.

The first provision in question is in section 205 (b), and relates to the proposed program for loans to students in institutions of higher education. It would provide that such a loan shall be made by the institution of higher education "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex."

It is our belief that the quoted language is declaratory of the inherent meaning of other provisions of section 205. Subsection 205 (b) (1) specifies criteria of eligibility for student loans; namely, (a) that the student be in need of the amount of the loan, and (b) that he be capable of maintaining good standing at the institution of higher education he attends. Subsections 303 (a) (2) and (3) of the Senate bill (S. 4237) contain similar language with reference to need of financial assistance and additional language requiring that special consideration be given to students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and who indicate an interest in teaching in elementary or secondary schools.

These provisions, in our opinion, would govern the determination of who are eligible students. Race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, or sex are not factors. Discrimination against eligible students on any such grounds would, therefore, be contrary to the above-mentioned provisions in the loan titles of each bill.

H. R. 13247 as it passed the House did not include a scholarship title. Such a title is, however, in the Senate bill, and we have had previous occasion to consider whether discrimination would be permissible in the selection of students for the award of scholarships. We concluded that the requirement for selection of individuals by the State commissions "in accordance with objective tests and other measures of aptitude and ability to pursue successfully" the college course (with special consideration to those who have superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language) would preclude the use of unrelated selection measures and would, therefore, prevent discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, or sex. An antidiscrimination provision in the scholarship title would, therefore, provide no new protection.

The second antidiscrimination provision of H. R. 13247 as it passed the House is contained in section 503 (a) regarding the award of fellowships for graduate education. Both the House provisions and title VI of the Senate bill contemplate the award of such fellowships from among those accepted for study in approved graduate programs. These awards would be made by the Commissioner of Education of this Department. It seems clear to me that the awards of such fellowships would be the same without as with an antidiscrimination provision.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOT L. RICHARDSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, it is very essential that this statement be made a part of the legislative record of the whole bill. I feel very deeply that every proponent of

the bill, regardless of what he might think about its details, desires that the program be administered in the spirit of complete nondiscrimination, as set forth in the letter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 3-12-58-C, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

On page 10, line 5, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$250."

On page 10, beginning with "Any" in line 6, strike out all through line 14.

On page 14, line 15, after the semicolon insert "and."

On page 14, line 22, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike out all following such line through line 13 on page 15.

On page 18, line 9, after "Loans" insert "first preference with respect to \$750 of such loan (except as provided in clause (4) below) shall be given to persons holding National Defense Scholarships, and after such first preference."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky desire?

Mr. COOPER. Ten minutes.

Mr. President, my amendment is a simple one. I do not believe it will require extensive explanation. I have placed on the Senators' desks a brief explanation of the amendment.

My amendment refers to title 2 of the bill, which is called National Defense Scholarships. As background for my amendment, I make this statement:

The President recommended 10,000 scholarships a year, for 4 years, with individual grants up to a maximum of \$1,000 a year, wholly on the basis of need. His recommendation was that all advances should be grants, and all on the basis of need.

The Committee bill provides 20,000 scholarships a year for 4 years, with initial awards of \$500 a year, and additional grants up to a maximum of \$500 a year, if need can be established. An outright grant of \$500 is made at once. Then if the person selected for a scholarship can establish need for additional funds, additional funds may be granted up to \$500. The total amount which would be made available to a high school student selected for a scholarship to the maximum of \$1,000 a year would be in the nature of a grant.

The House eliminated the entire title. There is no provision for scholarships in the House bill.

While I was not on the subcommittee on education we did discuss this matter of scholarships in the full committee. Amendments were offered. I offered an amendment which is not quite like the one I am offering tonight I proposed in committee, that one half of the amount advanced a student be in the form of a loan.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15915

I should like to explain what my amendment would do. The amendment would maintain the scholarship title. It would provide an award of \$250 a year, for each year the scholarship winner remained in college instead of the \$500 provided in the committee bill.

It also provides that if a student to whom a scholarship had been awarded could establish need for additional help, he can receive loans to a maximum of \$750 a year. My amendment would make available to a boy or girl selected for a scholarship the same amount of money provided in the committee bill—one thousand dollars—if need can be established. The grant would be \$250 instead of \$500, and the remainder up to \$1,000 would not be a grant, but a loan.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I wonder if the Senator would mind my suggesting another aspect of this proposal. Actually, under the bill, the total amount to which the winner of a scholarship award would be eligible is an outright grant of \$1,000, and not \$500. So it is \$250 against \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. The committee bill provides for an immediate award of \$500.

Mr. IVES. That is correct; but it provides for an ultimate amount of \$1,000, if necessary, whereas this total is \$250 overall, plus a loan of \$750.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the Senator from New York has raised a question which might be pursued further. Under the committee bill which is before the Senate, there would be an outright grant of \$500, with the right to borrow \$500 more, making available a total of \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. No; there would be the right to receive additional grants of \$500, if need could be established.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, it provides for grants of \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is worse than I thought it was. But under the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky there would be a grant of \$250, and if the student needed funds he could borrow \$750, making \$1,000 available to each student who might receive a scholarship.

Mr. COOPER. The same amount would be available. The conditions of the loan are prescribed in title III.

The fiscal effect would be this: The committee bill provides for an initial authorization of \$17,500,000 for the first year, and then such sums as may be necessary for the succeeding years. If the figures are broken down they would indicate a total of 20,000 scholarships a year, or 80,000 for the 4-year periods. The grant of \$500 per scholarship would amount to \$2,000 for each student in 4 years, or \$40 million for each class of students. The total cost would be at least \$160 million; and if we follow the calculations which the Depart-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare, evidently followed, assuming an appropriation of \$17,500,000 a year and scholarship grants averaging about \$750 per year, including the grants based on need, the projected cost of the committee bill would be \$240,000,000.

Following the same reasoning, the cost of my amendment would be less than half that figure or \$80 million. But cost is not the main issue on which I ask my amendment to be accepted by the Senate.

The reasoning favoring the scholarship provision is that it will encourage student to undertake scholastic achievement, and that it would help outstanding students who might not be able to obtain the funds to go to college. It is hoped also that the establishment of a scholarship program in a State, would stimulate high schools to revise their curricula—I hope they would—and return to the sciences, mathematics, and of the basic studies.

My amendment would achieve the same ends. The yearly award of \$250, a total of \$1,000 per student for 4 years in college, is an award for scholastic achievement. And if a student really wanted to go through to college, of course, there would be made available loans to an additional \$3,000 on easy terms, as will appear from a reading of the provisions of title 3.

My amendment would attract the more serious student, the one who wants to go to college and spend 4 years in study. My proposal would do everything that the committee had proposed to do, and at half the cost.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Can the Senator tell us whether the loan which would be provided under the terms of his amendment would be subject to forgiveness in the event a student went into the teaching profession?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I will allow myself 5 additional minutes.

The loan provisions of title III would apply to the amendment I have offered. Title III provides that a person receiving a loan may obtain forgiveness of the loan at the rate of 20 percent a year for each year served as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That would be provided, and it would apply to loans?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator inform us whether in the aggregate his amendment would increase or decrease the cost of title II of the bill; and, if so, by how much and in what way?

Mr. COOPER. The immediate reduction would be \$80 million for the scholarship grants. From that point on I cannot tell, because the remainder of the money would go to students in the

form of loans, instead of grants based on need. I cannot tell how much of it would be paid back and how much might be forgiven by reason of service as a teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

Mr. COTTON. The ultimate cost to the Government might be just as much? Mr. COOPER. It could be.

Mr. COTTON. It could be? *

Mr. COOPER. It could be if every student applied for and received an additional \$750 per year in loans, and did not repay it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield. It is not likely that it would cost as much as the committee bill, for I am sure that a great part of the loans would be repaid.

Mr. MORTON. It could be as much only in the unlikely event that every student had to draw the whole \$750, that every one of them went into teaching, and that every one of them continued to teach for 5 years.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It is unlikely all of the contingencies you mentioned would happen.

Mr. MORTON. Under any normal application of reason, it seems to me that the amendment would cut the cost virtually in half; certainly by 35 percent.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the cost would be cut as you say by at least 50 percent. How much, no one can say, but less than the committee bill.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is it not correct to say that this type of loan is generally the type of loan which is paid back? Generally speaking, in an educational loan there is no loss. People who borrow for their education are practically always sure to pay back their loans, unless death or some unusual circumstance intervenes. There are usually the best type of loans.

Mr. COOPER. Many colleges have revolving loan funds, and they maintain lending programs on the basis of the loans being repaid. The loans are repaid.

I close by saying I believe the amendment would achieve the same purposes as the committee amendment. In addition it would attract the serious students, students who are determined to go through college, and are willing to show their determination by borrowing part of the money, instead of accepting a full grant. It would save money for the Treasury. But I emphasize it would achieve the same objectives as the committee provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The House eliminated this entire title. It seems to me the Senator from Minnesota has a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

15916

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. It is in the nature of a substitute for the Cooper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Minnesota yield himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished and able Senator from Kentucky is an effort not to limit the number of scholarships which are available under the terms of the pending bill, but to limit the extent of the grants for the scholarships, and, in so doing, to replace the amount of the grants by loan availability both in the instance of scholarships and in the instance of the money which is required on the basis of need.

The Senator from Kentucky, in his explanation sheet of the amendment, has noted that the bill provides 22,000 scholarships a year for four years, with awards of \$500 a year for each scholarship. The bill provides additional grants, up to a maximum of \$500, if need can be established. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would limit the amount of the award of the scholarship to \$250, and would authorize loans up to \$750 if need can be established. The loans under the Cooper amendment would be made in the same manner as provided in title III of the bill, which is the loan feature of the proposed National Defense Education Act.

Mr. President, we ought to face what we are confronted with. The other body struck out the section of the bill relating to scholarships. The House decided, in passing the so-called national scholarship bill, to eliminate the scholarship feature. It decided that it would place the entire assistance program for deserving students on the basis of loans, rather than on the basis of awards for excellence, awards for intellectual attainment, awards for competency in education, and awards for those who have demonstrated the God-given attribute of unusual intellectual talent.

I cannot for the life of me understand why Congress, which has been willing to appropriate approximately \$40 billion for the defense of the nation in terms of manpower and material, should quibble about a provision in a national defense education bill which would grant some money to deserving students, on the basis of national competition for national scholarships.

I shall explain the purpose of my amendment. It is my view, which is

supported by the testimony, that there is a real need in the United States for at least 40,000 scholarships a year. This was, in fact, the figure included in the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and his cosponsors. The pending bill (S. 4327), when it was introduced earlier this year, provided for 40,000 scholarships. The year before that I introduced a bill providing for 40,000 scholarships. Why? Because the records of our educational institutions revealed that from 150,000 to 200,000 graduates of high schools, who were in the upper brackets of their classes in terms of intellectual and educational attainment, were not going to college. They were not going to college because of the lack of financial opportunities or financial resources.

We have eliminated the need-for-scholarships section. The bill as it was reported by the committee places the \$500 scholarship award entirely on the basis of merit and intellectual attainment. There is no element of need in that measure at all. The additional \$500 provided in the committee bill is to be disbursed if there is need, and the need can be demonstrated. Then the student who is awarded a national scholarship will be able to obtain \$1,000—\$500 as a scholarship award and \$500 as a grant on the basis of need. No one can know the number of students who will apply under the terms of the need provisions of the bill.

But let us face it: If the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky is adopted, then the Senate conferees, when they go into conference with the conferees of the other body, will be confronted with the choice of no scholarships on the basis of awards or grants, as is provided in the House bill, or a scholarship program proposed by the Senate with a minimum of \$250 or a maximum of \$250 on the basis of an award for intellectual attainment.

Are Senators to say that a student who is able to meet the requirements which will be established under legislation for a national scholarship will be given the paltry sum of \$250? There are shoe companies in the United States which provide larger scholarships than that. I pay tribute to the McAn Shoe Co., which gives scholarships of \$1,000 each to students, and in some instances more. There are cigarette paper manufacturing companies in the United States which give scholarships of more than \$1,000 each to deserving students. If they are only a few scholarships, but they are excellent scholarships.

But the Congress of the United States, which is endeavoring to promote education, which is planning to reward intellectual attainment, which is going to challenge the Soviet Union, proposes to offer scholarships at bargain-counter, discount-house, back-alley prices at \$250 a year.

If we are to have an educational program in which there are to be scholarships, let us have some real scholarships. A scholarship is not a mere piece of paper. A scholarship is a financial reward made on the basis of merit and intellectual attainment. It is an indication on

the part of the Government of the United States that we are serious about providing educational opportunities for gifted young men and women.

My amendment provides that at least 30,000 scholarships, under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, shall be provided. Very frankly, I say to my colleagues, if my amendment is not adopted, we will be compromising the scholarship program between 20,000 and zero when we go to conference. But with the Humphrey amendment, there will be a compromise between 30,000 and zero.

What is the total cost of the program? The total cost of the program about which we are speaking is \$22,500,000 under the terms of my amendment. That surely is not very much money. It is fair to say that some of the tests which are taking place of our nuclear weapons in the Pacific cost more than the total scholarship program proposed in any one year.

I gather that some think we are daring; that we are venturing forth into some uncharted area of human endeavor. They may carry severe restrictions which limit eligibility, but there is hardly a college in the land which has scholarships of less than \$250. We shall hardly be making a contribution to the national defense and welfare by offering such small scholarships.

I offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], not because I think the committee bill is not a good bill; I think it offers a good beginning. But I think the committee itself, in order to report the bill, had to compromise from the real educational requirements of the country.

My amendment provides for 30,000 scholarships, at a cost of \$22,500,000, as compared with \$17,500,000 in the committee bill, thus assisting a few more students in this great Nation in a period of expanding population, a few more deserving students the opportunity to become, so to speak, soldiers for peace in the front line of American democracy.

I point out that we are saying to deserving students, "If you can qualify under the rigid requirements of the proposal in the bill, you will get \$500 a year, and up to \$1,000 if you need it."

We know that even in the Armed Forces \$10,000 a year is required for the training of each man. But Congress is still fiddling around with an educational program and is talking about the defense of America in terms of \$250 a student.

Let me conclude my argument by quoting from the committee report. The report of the committee is in behalf of a figure of 23,000 scholarships, which the committee ultimately recommended, but the report justifies 40,000. I submit that the testimony before the committee justifies 40,000. I submit that the testimony of the military officers before the committee justifies at least 50,000.

I was never able to understand why the President asked for 10,000, because not a single one of his witnesses, except a Cabinet officer who came before the committee to back the administration,

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15917

ever said that 10,000 scholarships were adequate.

Dr. Detlev Bronk told the committee:

I would recommend that scholarships be used not as a means of financial support only * * * I would use a scholarship program for the raising of standards, for setting higher levels of achievement toward which to strive.

Dr. Bronk further said:

It is a prize awarded for achievement, for unusual excellence, and for unusual prominence.

I ask my colleagues, Is the best the Senate can do a prize of a mere \$250 a year to a deserving student for unusual achievement, for unusual prominence, for unusual excellence? Is that all?

There are hundreds of colleges in the United States which give football players and basketball players, for their unusual ability on the gridiron or the court, five times \$250 a year.

I submit that if this is an education bill to aid the national defense, we ought to consider it as a defense measure and not a consolation prize.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the entire matter of scholarships. I shall not take the time of my colleagues to read it. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—THE NEED FOR FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

I am for scholarships—for lots of them—and for scholarships based on intellectual merit. I would like to explain why.

I have read the debates on the companion bill to this measure that were held last week in the House, and I read with particular interest the various comments made with respect to the desirability or undesirability of a program of Federal scholarships awarded on the basis of merit alone. This is a subject which I find of particular interest and which I think deserves our most serious consideration.

Only once—and then only in passing—did any of the participants in the discussion held on the floor of the House mention the one factor which I consider a most important, a vitally important, reason for keeping scholarships in this bill and for awarding those scholarships on the basis of merit: Scholarships which will be evidence to the entire world that the Government of the United States respects the young mind that devotes itself to work and study and application; scholarships which, being granted on the basis of merit alone, will bring about that one change in attitude on the part of parents that more than anything else is needed to assure us that local school boards throughout the country will concentrate on seeing to it that the students in their schools will have the very best in educational opportunity that the local community can possibly afford. I am thinking of the effects which a scholarship program based on merit alone will have on the parents of America's youth—of how such a program will inevitably and quickly make parents throughout the country take a really hard look at the kind of education being offered in the schools which their particular children attend. For a scholarship program based on merit will do just that. And that more than anything else is what we need to revitalize our educational system and to guarantee that emphasis on quality education will be continuous.

Let's get down to cases. Let's forget the generalities. Let's see exactly what it will mean to the student and to his parents in any local community in the Nation if we pass this bill and include in it a sizable number of sizable scholarships awarded on the basis of merit alone.

First of all, no one questions the fact that it would be a terrific incentive to our brighter students in all our high schools if they were to be offered an opportunity to win an accolade and a substantial sum of money from the Government of these United States for outstanding scholarship. The child who all too often is made to feel queer and out of line if he studies math and plays chess, instead of studying rock and roll and playing the young tough, would find himself working in a new atmosphere and shoulder to shoulder with thousands of bright students in his State and Nation rather than alone.

Second, are there any parents of America who would not be proud—exceedingly proud—to have a son or daughter win the recognition of the Nation as being an outstanding young citizen who has willingly devoted his time and his talents to work which the Nation needs done for its defense? There is no question but that every parent would encourage his child to strive to win such honor and such national acclaim.

It is of the utmost importance to the Nation that we get the parents of America to pay constant attention to the quality of education being offered in their local schools. I am willing to wager without any hesitation at all that within a week after the first scholarships under such a program as this bill contemplates are awarded you would see such an upsurge of interest in our high schools on the part of parents as have never been dreamed possible. Once the results were announced and it was discovered—and I think this is what would be discovered—that most of the scholarships offered in any particular State had been won by students enrolled in a relatively small number of the high schools of that State, you can well imagine how quickly and how insistently parents who have children enrolled in other high schools would demand to know why the quality of work in their own high schools was lower than in the schools which produced the scholarship winners. They will want to know why—they will demand to know why—and they will have a real and compelling reason for seeing to it that the deficiencies thus uncovered are corrected.

Right now most of our parents perforce have to content themselves by taking a look at the school building. If the building looks fine they assume that the children attending courses in that building are getting a good education. With the awarding of scholarships such as are proposed in this bill they will have their first real way of finding out whether or not, they are. They will have discovered that the quality of teachers is important, and they will have to start paying decent salaries to get quality. They will quickly learn that it doesn't matter how beautiful or how new the school building is, but rather how good the teachers are, how many books and how much equipment they have, what courses are offered and which, if any, their children are required to take. They'll get a real glimpse at just how much importance their particular community has placed on brains, and they'll begin to attach much more to it. But this will happen, only if these scholarships are awarded on the basis of merit and if the awards are really sizable, not less than \$500. For it is obvious that if we give scholarships on the basis of need only, or if we give scholarships that have no really meaningful relationship to the cost of a college education today, we will be offering no reason whatsoever for parents to take the kind of interest in the schools that I have been talking about and which we so fervently want them to take in those schools.

On the other hand, and when we consider the cost of a college education today, I think I can say that, without question, if we are to offer sizable scholarships in sizable amounts, better than 90 percent of the parents of high school students in this country will really sit up and take notice. Why? Because, gentlemen, the cost of sending one child—to say nothing of 2 or 3 at the same time—to college today comes as a terrific shock not just to America's poorer families but to families with incomes big enough to put them in the upper one-fifth of the population financially. Ask any of the young men who work in your offices and who are beginning to contemplate sending their children to college—men earning anywhere from \$6,000 to \$10,000 or \$13,000 a year. They are top earners amongst America's families. They will tell you that they and their neighbors are seriously worried about the changes they will have to make in their families' patterns of living when the time comes to send a youngster away to school. Not only are they concerned, but they are very greatly interested in any proposal which shows promise of easing this great strain on the family income. Were we to enact the kind of scholarship proposal I am talking about, these parents in upper income brackets, and, of course, parents in every income bracket lower, would show a real and responsible interest in the results. They would play a really active role in determining the type of high schools America would operate in the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Can the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota be offered in lieu of my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is in order as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, but is not in order as a complete substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would simply change one figure set forth in the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the ruling of the Chair that my amendment is in order as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I so offer the amendment.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, later, I shall again request the yeas and nays, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

15918

Let me say that I understand that in the meantime the Senator from Kentucky wishes to reply to the comment I have made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the comment made by the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, am not I entitled to have time in which to speak on the amendment which has been offered to my amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky wishes to speak in regard to the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota has offered to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I am willing to yield time to the Senator from Kentucky. How much time does he wish to have yielded to him?

Mr. COOPER. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate should understand that the effect of the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has submitted to my amendment is this: The Humphrey amendment would delete from the second line, on page 1 of my amendment, the figure "\$5,000,000," and would insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$22,500,000"; and that amount would be available for the first year.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that his amendment would provide 100,000 new scholarships per year, if my proposal for an initial award of \$250 a year is maintained. Senators who vote to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to my amendment will vote for approximately 100,000 new scholarships a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish to have my amendment interpreted as providing for an annual payment of \$250 in the case of each scholarship. Instead, my amendment, if agreed to, would provide for scholarships of up to \$1,000 each; and my purpose in submitting the amendment is to provide for scholarships of \$1,000 each as provided in the committee bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my amendment specifically provides that the annual amount available for each scholarship grant will be \$250.

Therefore, Mr. President, I rise to a point of order, and request a ruling by the Chair as to whether I have correctly stated the effect of the Humphrey amendment to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the point of order is well taken, in that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota would change only the figure "\$5,000,000" in the second line on page 1 of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment calls for a change in the amount on page 9 of the bill, in line 15, where the figure "\$17,500,000" appears.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$17,500,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$22,500,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment is offered in the nature of a substitute, on the basis of the change I propose in the figure which just now has been read by the clerk. My amendment would retain in the bill, as reported by the committee, the figure "\$500," on page 10, in line 5, which is the maximum amount assigned to scholarships based on merit alone.

The whole purpose of my amendment is not only to increase the amount of money available for scholarships, but also, I say most respectfully—because I sincerely disagree with the amount proposed by the Senator from Kentucky—to maintain the \$500 allowance for each scholarship based on merit, with an additional \$500 permitted on the base of need. That is why my amendment is submitted as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment provides a total of \$5 million be authorized for the first year, and that a grant of \$250 annually be awarded for each scholarship, and that up to \$750 may be made available to students awarded scholarships, as a loan, in the nature of a loan. The total could be \$1,000 per year—the same as the committee amendment.

The Senator from Minnesota has submitted, as an amendment to my amendment, a proposal which he states is in the nature of a substitute. But it would only change the amount authorized for appropriation for the first year, \$5 million to \$22,500,000. I submit that the remainder of my amendment would not be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, and that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, would be limited by the remainder of my amendment.

Mr. President, I request a ruling—whether his amendment can be a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

The provisions set forth on page 2 of the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would not be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The first provision on page 2 of the Cooper amendment relates to page 10 of the bill; the last provision on page 2 of the Cooper amendment relates to the language appearing on page 18 of the bill.

The only part of the Cooper amendment which would be affected by the Humphrey amendment is the second line

on page 1. At that point in the Cooper amendment, the figure "\$5 million" would be stricken out by the Humphrey amendment, and the figure "\$22,500,000" would be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. COOPER. Then, Mr. President, the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would be to increase the number of scholarships from 20,000 to over 80,000 a year. I do not think the Senate would wish to have that done.

Mr. President, under my amendment, a student approved for a scholarship could receive the same amount of money he could receive under the bill reported by the committee. When the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] states that I am proposing to reduce the money available to a student and making it difficult to attend college, such a statement is in error, and does not recognize the purpose of my amendment. I repeat any student could receive a total of \$1,000 a year, or \$4,000 during a 4-year college course. During those 4 years, he would receive a grant of a total of \$1,000—on the basis of \$250 a year; and if he so desired, he could secure a loan, over the 4-year period, totaling \$3,000. The loan would run for 12 years, at easy interest rates and without security. But if the student enters the teaching profession, the loan would be forgiven, at the rate of 20 percent a year.

If a student has the desire to attend college and get an education, I know of no better way than under my amendment.

I believe that many students would much prefer to receive a grant of \$250 a year, and loans for the balance rather than to have their total expenses paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have not quite finished my statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the Senate knows that throughout my service in the Senate I have voted again and again for Federal aid to education; for aid to teachers, and for school construction. I have introduced bills to give Federal aid. In 1954, I was chairman of the subcommittee on education, and worked for and reported to the Senate a Federal aid bill.

Earlier today, I voted for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] to provide Federal aid for school construction.

So I speak as a friend of improving the educational system of our country.

But, I believe with all my heart that my amendment conforms more nearly to the spirit of the people of our country than does the committee's proposal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the hour grows late. I know everyone is tired. Sometimes it is very difficult to legislate in such circumstances.

I should like to say something about the bill. I am afraid we are now in a quandry. We are pulling two ways in trying to accomplish the intention of the bill. We all know the House has taken out of its bill the scholarship provisions.

I am afraid our distinguished friend from Kentucky has misconceived the real purpose of the scholarship provision. If the scholarships are merely to send more young people to college, I say let us strike out title II of the bill, as the House did and leave only the loan title. But the purpose of the scholarship emphasis is this: Realizing many of our primary and secondary schools are much below their possibilities in the development of our youth, we must put some emphasis on tightening up the academic atmosphere of our high schools, and even of our primary schools.

If the Senate were to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, we would flood the country with many small, cheap scholarships, which would provide no drive, no incentive, and no honor to the students who received them. In fact, in my opinion, we would be much better advised, if it is necessary to make an adjustment in the cost of this title, to go the other way and cut the number of scholarships in half and double the amounts allowed for the scholarships, so that we would intensify and deepen the significance and the honor of the awards, and accordingly increase the interest in scholarship generally.

I am afraid if we adopted the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky we would cheapen the value of the national defense scholarships to the point where the significance of the scholarships would be nothing, minimal when they are intended to be a badge of honor and something to impel students to work harder, and to bring about more intensive study and tougher curriculums.

I say to my friend from Minnesota, with reference to the amendment he has proposed, that reasonable men can differ as to the amount which should be in the bill. The House has stricken the title from its bill. The figure arrived at by the committee was reached after many weeks and months of discussion and intense debate, not only in the subcommittee but in the full committee. I believe it represents an eminently reasonable judgment of the committee as to the amount and number of scholarships which should be provided, so as best to combine the maximum impact of the scholarship program and a reasonable cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wanted to say a few words on the subject. Both the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have offered amendments which are diametrically opposed. It illustrates what we were up against in the committee. Different ideas were expressed. The committee finally came to the conclusion that what is contained in the committee bill is the best solution.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for what he has said. He was one who felt we should have a larger amount for scholarships. He was willing to compromise, and agreed to the figures contained in the committee bill, which he is supporting.

I feel the Senate would be making a terrible mistake if, at this time of night, it tried to arrive at what is the best combination. It is a difficult question. The committee did the best it could after weeks of testimony, asking witnesses their opinions, and reaching the best judgment it could. To change at this time what the committee has arrived at as a solution seems to be a futile thing to do from the standpoint of getting legislation enacted promptly.

I urge that the Senate get to a vote, and I urge defeat of both the Cooper amendment and the Humphrey amendment, and that the Senate adhere to the decision of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what has been said by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. This amendment or an amendment similar to it, was offered by the Senator from Kentucky in committee, and the committee rejected the amendment.

As the Senator from Colorado has stated, to cheapen the scholarships would be to defeat the very purpose of having scholarships. As Dr. DuBridge, who is president of California Institute of Technology, and one of the most eminent scientists and scientific leaders of the country, emphasized before our committee, not only should we have scholarships, but we should provide that they be in sufficient amount as to constitute an honor, and stimulate, and present a challenge to, the boys and girls, and to the parents of the boys and girls, and to the schools themselves, in order that better curriculums and better courses may be established, and in order that boys and girls may take more difficult courses in mathematics, science, and engineering, and better prepare themselves to serve our country and the defense of our country.

As the Senate knows, President Eisenhower did not limit his recommendation to a small amount like \$250. He stated that, where there was a need, the amount should go up to \$1,000.

I urge the Senate to vote down both of these amendments.

I understand why my distinguished friend from Minnesota offered his amendment. In offering the amendment, he was in line with my original thought in the matter. The bill I originally introduced for myself and 25 other Senators provided for 40,000 scholarships. After considering the matter, as the Senator from New Jersey has stated, the committee arrived at the provision now in the bill. We urge the Senate to stand by the committee's provision. Knowing that we have to deal with the House, do not tie the hands of the Senate conferees before they can even get to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Humphrey amendment, and, as compared with the Cooper amendment, in favor of the Cooper amendment; but I primarily wish to address myself to the proposition of entering into the field of Federal scholarships for education.

I believe the present temper of the Senate is such that we shall probably destroy a landmark in American government in the final vote on this very bill, unless some opinions are changed. I believe we shall do it for false reasons, or at least for insufficient reasons.

I wish to point out those reasons, briefly. I believe this is one of the sputnik bills. It got off the ground when sputnik went into orbit. There was a great deal of talk and thought on the subject. Perhaps some Senators committed themselves to a bill without going far enough and considering just what it might mean.

I notice this bill is wrapped up with the words "National Defense." That expression is on every single page of this 59-page report. It is on the first page the second time. It is on page 7 at the top. Every time the title changes, it is in there—National Defense Student Loan Program; National Defense Act; National Defense Scholarships. Almost everything that has been before the Congress at this session has been wrapped up in these misleading words.

I have not had a chance to hear very much of the debate today, but I passed through in time to catch another familiar refrain this morning, "What is Russia going to do?" There is a fear of Russia.

Mr. President, it seems to me we are living too much in an atmosphere of fear as to what Russia is going to do. I have heard every briefing on the subject of what Russia is trying to do, beginning last December and continuing until yesterday. I have a fear of only one thing Russia may do, and that is that Russia may outwork us.

We talk about a National Defense Act. No one says anything about advocating a 40-hour week. No one says anything much about putting more spine and more grit into the backbones of our youth. Nothing is said about a more rigid line of training. We rush in again, as we do

15920

every time, with a big bag of money. The debate is primarily as to how much money should be provided. The talk is of dollars and more dollars. This is another time we are attempting to solve a problem mainly and largely with money, and it is another time when I think money will fail.

If we really think Russia is going to jump up in a few years and overcome us, although we have 182 years of political freedom behind us, since the birth of our Nation, fortified by 1,000 years of free institutions prior to then, and fine traditions, culture and scientific achievements, and if we really believe these things have to be done because of what Russia may do, then I submit, Mr. President, we are already whipped to begin with.

I do not yield to anyone when it comes to being interested in education and the proper training of the youth of America, but I believe when we get into the field of Federal scholarships we are going to kill the heart and soul of the other kind of scholarships. I believe it will be like digging a well beside another well. One may dig a large well and a well which seems to be better, but it will dry up the original source. I think we are treading on the most dangerous kind of ground, without really considering the value of what we have, or the consequences of the action.

All day long we stayed in the Appropriations Committee yesterday and argued about the supplemental appropriation bill, which totaled \$3.8 billion, and then came to the floor. What was the argument about? The argument was about reducing taxes in the face of a known \$12 billion to \$14 billion deficit.

With all deference, many of those who are in favor of the highest figure in this bill were in favor of the highest reduction of taxes last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate, but I simply state a warning. Those of us who have been wrestling with these figures in the Appropriations Committee are aware of the problem. Every program costs more and more and is growing larger all the time. Costs are going up while tax income is going down. There is not too much being done to try to remedy the situation.

We talk about leadership. We talk about being overcome by Russia. Let us concentrate on a few fundamentals. There will be plenty of time for Federal scholarships later.

Mr. President, I come from the State of Mississippi, and I am very proud of it. My State is sometimes pointed to as the one with the lowest individual income. I visited at my home college in Mississippi last March.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. There was one thing we were agreed on. I spoke on scholarships at the alumni meeting. All of us were agreed there is not a single worthy boy or girl in the State now who does not have a chance to get a higher education if he or she has a little grit and determination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. If I have any time remaining, I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to associate myself with the splendid and sound sentiments voiced by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. As a choice between evils, I support the Cooper amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

It is my intention to withdraw my amendment because in a discussion with the Parliamentarian I have learned the only way we can have a vote on the Cooper amendment and the criteria to be established is for me to withdraw the amendment and then later to offer my amendment de novo at another time.

I offered my amendment for one purpose. There was no thought of in any way disparaging the committee bill. I offered my amendment to demonstrate to the Members of the Senate that in my mind a Federal scholarship of \$250 is an insult to the intellectual attainment of American students.

Mr. President, I do not judge my life by what Russia does. As an American I am not going to judge what we ought to do in this Congress by what Russia does. I would like to judge what we do by what we ought to do. There are many things which need to be done in America, even if there had never been a Communist. I, for one, am fed up to the gills with talk to the effect that we ought to do this or the Communists will get us.

We ought to educate the bright young men and women of our country as an investment in life. We ought to educate our bright students because God Almighty gave them brain power. We do not have enough gumption at times in America to give these young men and women the opportunity they need to use their brain power.

I hear much about fantastic sums of money. I say to Senators that my own University of Minnesota spends twice as much a year—that one university—as what is involved in the scholarship program under the amendment I have offered. The University of Minnesota is one of the greatest universities in the world. It is the second largest, and 1 of the top 10 in intellectual attainment, in the United States. We take a back seat to no one.

Mr. President, when I hear about the dangers of Federal scholarships, I should like to remind my colleagues, every one of them, of what they have been doing for years. We have been giving Federal scholarships to every young man who goes to the Military Academy at West Point, to the Naval Academy, to the Air Force Academy, or to the Coast Guard School or any other place we send them. And they are not \$250 scholarships. Their average cost is \$5,000 a year. All those young men do not become generals, either, many of them become engineers, go into accounting, or into some other line.

In addition, we have appropriated literally hundreds of millions of dollars for facilities for the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Army Academy, which I encourage. I am not complaining; I merely want to set the Record straight.

I hear that somehow or other a Federal scholarship may be bad. If that is the case, may I say there are some very prominent men in America today who have enjoyed Federal scholarships? One can draw his own conclusions. They are not bad men.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct when he says we ought not to be judging our actions on the basis of what Russia is doing or will do. America has the greatest educational system in the world, and I want it to be greater. I say that no Member of this body can really in his own heart justify taking 1, 2, or 3 years from a young man's life for service in the military forces—for plain old military duty—and then ignore that young man's brainpower. This country is not in trouble because of soft living; it is in trouble because of soft thinking. Literally thousands of students in America today are not being given the opportunity they need.

One can say if students had gumption or "get up and go" they would go to college. I can talk about that. Nobody paid my way through college. Perhaps I did not have much gumption or "get up and go," but I earned every day of it—every living last day of it. I did not have any scholarship, either. Perhaps I could not qualify. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there are many universities in America today which are better universities because of Federal grants. There are many universities in America today which would not be universities without the Land-Grant College Act, the first great Federal grant for universities. The first great educational grant was the Northwest Ordinance.

I happen to think the Government of the United States is as good as the government of Minnesota. I happen to believe the Government of the United States, if it can take time from the lives of my sons—and I have three—is also entitled to give something to their education. What do Senators think of that? If the Government can put my sons in the Army, it can also, if they have the brainpower, help them go to college. I am talking about the right of our country to survive. If we are going to stack up

man for man and body for body against the Soviets, we are licked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 2 more minutes. I have had this in my craw for a long time, and it is about time I got it out.

I think this country has some sort of idea that all we need to beat the Soviets is more bombs and more trained troops. If that is all we need, we shall be licked. What we need more than anything else is more know-how, supported by faith in and understanding of the democratic processes in which we believe. We believe in individuality. An individuality which is ignorant or untrained is not much of an individuality. I want an American individualism that is the best God Almighty can provide, with man's ingenuity to embellish it. That is why I believe in a scholarship program.

In all frankness, the committee has reported a good bill, but the chairman of the committee has said tonight that the amendment which I offer, providing for 30,000 scholarships, is no radical venture. I predict that before long there will be many more than 30,000 scholarships. This is the beginning, and a good beginning. To cut back the number of scholarships or the grants in connection with scholarships would be to do the wrong thing at the right time.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment. I hope that the amendment offered by my friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], whom I admire as one of the great Members of this body, will be defeated. If it is, I shall support the committee bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota having been withdrawn, the question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McNamara
Allott	Green	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hennings	Morton
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Hobbs	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Bridges	Humphrey	Proxmire
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kerr	Sparkman
Cooper	Knowland	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Talmadge
Douglas	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworsnak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ervin	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Goldwater	Martin, Pa.	Young
	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. "Is the Senate about to vote on the Cooper amendment?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question recurs on the Cooper amendment. All time has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—46		
Aiken	Eastland	Mundt
Barrett	Ervin	Purtell
Beall	Frear	Revercomb
Bennett	Goldwater	Robertson
Bible	Hobbs	Russell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Bush	Jenner	Stennis
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Talmadge
Byrd	Jordan	Thurmond
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Wiley
Cooper	Malone	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	Young
Curtis	McClellan	
Dworsnak	Morton	

NAYS—42		
Allott	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Capehart	Humphrey	Morse
Carroll	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Church	Kefauver	Potter
Clark	Kennedy	Proxmire
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Long	Sparkman
Gore	Magnuson	Symington
Green	Mansfield	Thye
Hayden	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Hennings		

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Holland	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Javits	Payne
Flanders	Murray	

So Mr. COOPER's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral services of Congressman McVey.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference in London as Chairman of the

Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, line 17, after the second "of" it is proposed to insert "of Latin America."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on page 41, line 17 of the bill there are mentioned the languages which are to be taught in the language development title, which is title VIII. I understand that the languages of Latin America are not included. The predominant languages are Spanish and Portuguese. It seems to me, in the light of the recent visit of the Vice President—

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It seems to me, in the light of recent experiences of the Vice President in Latin America, a matter which I, living on the border, can assure the Senate stems to a great degree from our failure to learn a beautiful language, Spanish, my amendment should be adopted. I ask the distinguished chairman if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, line 5, after the word "payments" it is proposed to strike out the words "under any scholarship, fellowship, or grant," and insert in lieu thereof the words "or loans."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all I should like to congratulate the committee on the language on page 62 where, in carrying out the suggestions of the National Science Foundation, and in line with good American practice, the Senate is assured that students qualifying for the scholarships shall be good Americans

15922

and not be people involved in Communist or any other subversive organizations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I have discussed the situation with some legal experts. While there is some doubt among them that this language would provide the same protection for all titles of the bill, the chairman of the committee and I both feel that certainly that is the intention of the committee, and I believe the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator discussed his amendment with me. In my opinion it is a qualifying amendment. I know of no objection to it, and I will accept it.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the bill providing as follows:

That the State of Indiana be excluded from the provisions of this act.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. Then perhaps I shall have to yield myself more time, because I do not believe I can make Senators understand the purpose of my amendment in so short a time.

I spent between 45 and 50 minutes on the floor this afternoon explaining the position of the State of Indiana with respect to this matter. Indiana has gone to considerable trouble and expense to make a survey of its entire educational system. The report on the survey has been filed with this body. It has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a State having a total population of 4½ million, of all the students who were examined in all the schools of Indiana, it was found that among those who could qualify, only 53 students needed help. The people of Indiana have already risen to that need by raising a scholarship fund to take care of those 53 students. In other words, we do not want Federal help, we do not need Federal help, and we know that Congress cannot afford to give us Federal help.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate at this late hour. My remarks were extended at great length this afternoon and by previous insertions in the Record. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would it be germane to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana by adding the following sentence—

Mr. JENNER. To include Oregon? That will be all right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The sentence is: "Nor shall any farm subsidy be paid to any resident of the State of Indiana."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be germane.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. (Putting the question.) In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. JENNER. The Chair is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer amendments which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "each fiscal year, beginning with"; and after the second comma on line 22, insert "and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years the sum of."

On page 52, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(3) That funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes; I hope I will not need all of it.

My amendments are intended to bring title X into conformity with the other titles of S. 4237, and to restrict title X to the purposes stated in the report.

The amendment would, first, limit to 4 years the authorizations for appropriations for the new area vocational educational programs which would be established by title X; second, provide that funds authorized to be appropriated for such programs shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields related to the national defense.

It seems to me that when we start a new program like this, it should be limited. I have discussed the first part of the amendment with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I do not believe they have any objection to the amendments.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendments, because we do not know how the program will work. It seems to me that since the program is experimental, it should have a limitation, and the limitation of 4 years is a reasonable one.

The second part of the amendment simply seeks to point up in the bill what the committee says it wants to do in the way of training personnel in the fields which are necessary for the national defense. I could elaborate on that subject, but the hour is late. I simply emphasize that the amendments are not in conflict with the committee report but are actually in support of the committee report.

The bill ought not to be vague. If money is to be appropriated for this particular program, it should be pinpointed for the purposes intended, and made secure for the purposes for which the committee report intends it to be used.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have discussed these amendments with the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of the committee. We will take the amendments to conference.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 23, after the period, add the following:

For the purposes of title IV, the term "secondary school" may include a junior college, as determined by State law.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

My amendment will allow States, such as California and Michigan, and other States, which have private junior colleges to receive assistance under title IV. A junior college, in many cases, is nothing more than an extension of a secondary school. The assistance will be for the purpose of obtaining equipment, whether it be for science, mathematics, or foreign languages. The money would be made available according to a State plan administered by a State school official.

My amendment would make the minimum allowance available to junior colleges. It would not take anything away from the States. If a State so desired, it could take advantage of the plan. That would be within the discretion of the State.

I hope the chairman of the committee will agree to take the amendment to conference. The amendment was offered in the House when the bill was considered there and was adopted by the House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator state again where his amendment applies?

Mr. POTTER. My amendment changes the definition on page 8, line 23. It reads as follows:

For the purposes of title IV, the term secondary school may include a junior college, as determined by State law.

Mr. HILL. I do not know why junior colleges should be included any more than other colleges. If junior colleges are to be included, I do not know where to draw the line between a junior college and a senior college. Colleges are not included in the bill now.

Mr. POTTER. In many States, as the Senator well knows, a junior college is nothing more, really, than an extension of secondary education. A State does not have to include them unless it so desires.

If a State so desires to spread the money in such a way as to include the junior colleges, I believe it should have the right to do so.

Mr. HILL. So far as a scholarship winner was concerned, he could attend a junior college if he selected it. But I do not know why we should select junior colleges in contradistinction to other colleges, and should provide that the junior colleges should receive the grants now provided for the secondary and elementary schools.

Mr. POTTER. I know that in many cases—I know it is true in my State—a junior college is really an extension of a secondary school, and in many cases the junior college and the secondary school use the same facilities. The exact arrangement depends in the State plans. There has to be an allotment for each State. States which do not care to do so would not have to do so. But I know that in some States the junior college is really a part of the preparatory program for the Senior college.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to do anything I can to be helpful to my friend, the Senator from Michigan. But I believe we would be doing violence to the bill if we included in it a provision that the junior colleges would receive benefits which would not be received by senior colleges. In fact, in some States the junior colleges are tied in with the senior colleges.

So I do not know why in the pending bill we should provide that the junior colleges should receive grants which would be denied to other colleges.

Mr. POTTER. Of course, the Senator from Alabama realizes that this provision was included in the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. That may be true; but we must vote on the merits of these matters, as they appeal to us.

I do not believe we would be justified in providing that junior colleges would receive special treatment which would not be received by other colleges.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Morton in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator from Michigan considered having this provision apply to junior colleges up to the 12th grade? In other words, they would not be excluded, as junior colleges, up to what would normally be the secondary school level.

Mr. HILL. Under the definition, the junior colleges are included, through the

12th grade, regardless of whether the institution calls itself a high school or junior college. However the institution denominates itself, it would be included, up through the 12th grade, but not beyond the 12th grade.

Mr. POTTER. Even though it called itself a junior college?

Mr. HILL. Such institutions are not included beyond the 12th grade, regardless of what they call themselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I believe it important that we establish the legislative history in connection with this matter. I understand that it is the opinion of the chairman of the committee that even though the institution might be a junior college, it would be included, up through the 12th grade.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan is withdrawn.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to strike out all through line 2, on page 41.

It is proposed to strike out references to title VII and sections therein in the bill, and to renumber titles and sections of the bill as needed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Arizona yield to himself?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I realize that the hour is late, and that my colleagues are anxious to go to their homes. However, I would remind them that the Senate is on the brink of taking a very dangerous step in American history; and I, for one, do not intend to hurry homeward before my tasks are completed.

My amendment would strike out title VII of the bill; it is the title which would provide Federal grants to State educational agencies to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

These days, the term "testing" covers a great deal more than simple tests of knowledge of reading, writing, arithmetic, English, history, and science. It includes I. Q. tests, personality check lists, problem check lists, psychological aptitude tests of all sorts and descriptions.

Most of these tests are given in an atmosphere of secrecy or semisecrecy. Neither the children nor their parents are permitted to know the scorings. Children are often admonished not to tell their parents the questions asked. The test publishers sell the tests only to schools or other institutions—never to laymen.

It has occurred to me, however, that if we are to authorize the appropriation of the taxpayers' money for these tests, we have the right—even the duty—to find out what sort of tests they are.

I hold in my hand a test which is published by one of the more popular test-makers, the Science Research Associates. The test is entitled "Science Research Associates, Junior Inventory—Form A."

The child is told to mark each one of the statements which sets forth what constitutes a problem to him or to her.

I may say that my staff obtained the document, despite the opposition of the educational branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I shall read some of the significant items. On page 1 appears the heading "My Health."

I read some of the items which appear under the heading:

1. I wish I didn't have pimples on my face.
2. Sometimes it hurts when I breathe.
16. I have a thumping in my chest.
17. My stomach hurts a lot.
22. I can't hold onto my pencil.
24. My hand shakes too much.
25. Sometimes I get real dizzy.
28. I have to pick my nose a lot.
29. I sneeze a lot.
30. My skin itches.
35. I have no "pep."
39. I don't like to eat.
43. I am too thin.
45. Sometimes I wet my bed.

Under the heading "Getting Along With Other People," we find the following, among others:

46. I need more friends.
47. I can't make friends with very many kids.
49. I don't like people.
50. People don't like me very much.
57. I'm afraid of people.
59. People think I'm a sissy.
68. The girls don't like to play with me.
69. The boys don't like to play with me.
70. I'd rather play with little kids.
77. I wish people would leave me alone.
78. Nobody likes me.
79. People hurt my feelings.
80. I don't know how to act at a party.
83. I can't work with people.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is a test of the type which we would have given to the brilliant students of the Nation, in order to determine at an early age which ones would ultimately receive grants by way of Federal scholarships.

I read further from the test:

84. I don't know how to talk to people.
85. I don't know why people get mad at me.
87. I'd like to know more about girls.

Under the heading "About Me and My School," we find the following, among others:

89. I don't like school.
90. I don't like schoolbooks.
95. I don't like history.
96. I don't like geography.
97. I don't like social studies.
102. I don't see why I have to go to school.
118. I'm afraid of tests.
121. I don't like teachers.
129. I'm afraid of teachers.
131. I'd like to quit school now.
132. My schoolwork is too easy.

Under the heading "About Myself," we find the following, among others:

133. I am not nice looking.
134. I bite my fingernails too much.

137. I feel bad about things I do.
138. I tell too many lies.
139. I feel mad most of the time.
140. I am afraid my mother or daddy might die.
141. Sometimes I wish I was dead.
142. Sometimes I have to steal things.
146. I want to be good, and I can't.
147. I don't know what is wrong with me.
149. I worry too much.
150. I'd like to be a boy.
151. I'd like to be a girl.
153. I'd like more clothes.
160. I'm afraid of the doctor.
162. I'm afraid of the dark.
163. I'm afraid to be home alone at night.
165. I am too nervous.
168. I am too bashful.
170. I am too careless.
172. I am too crabby.
173. I can't go to sleep at night.
174. I have bad dreams.
177. I don't have enough money.

Under the heading "About Me and My Home," we find the following, among others.

178. I wish we had more money.
183. I wish I could go to more movies.
184. I don't have enough things to play with.
185. I wish we had a nice house.
186. I don't like my home.
187. I wish my daddy was home more.
188. I wish my mother would come back.
191. I wish I didn't have a brother.
192. I wish I didn't have a sister.
195. My mother is too bossy.
196. My daddy is too bossy.
199. I don't like my brother.
201. I wish my mother liked me more.
203. My mother and daddy often fight.
204. My mother treats me like a little kid.
205. My daddy treats me like a little kid.
207. My daddy won't help me.
208. I don't like babies.
215. I am afraid of my mother.
216. I am afraid of my daddy.
222. My home is too dirty.
223. I have to do too much work at home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire list printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY HEALTH

1. I wish I didn't have pimples on my face.
2. Sometimes it hurts when I breathe.
3. I get out of breath when I run or play.
4. I cough a lot in the morning.
5. My feet hurt when I play.
6. My feet hurt all the time.
7. I have sores between my toes.
8. My eyes itch.
9. My eyes hurt a lot.
10. Sometimes my ears hurt.
11. My nose bleeds a lot.
12. My teeth hurt.
13. My head hurts a lot.
14. My throat hurts a lot.
15. My chest hurts.
16. I have a thumping in my chest.
17. My stomach hurts a lot.
18. My back hurts.
19. My arms hurt a lot.
20. My hand hurts a lot.
21. My fingers hurt.
22. I can't hold on to my pencil.
23. My legs hurt a lot.
24. My hand shakes too much.
25. Sometimes I get real dizzy.
26. I get tired of sitting.
27. I have little sores on my skin.
28. I have to pick my nose a lot.
29. I sneeze a lot.
30. My skin itches.
31. It hurts when I go to the toilet.
32. I'm sick a lot.
33. I have a lot of colds.

34. I "throw up" a lot.
35. I have no "pep."
36. I can't hear very well.
37. I can't see very well.
38. I am hungry a lot.
39. I don't like to eat.
40. I am always so sleepy.
41. I am not strong enough.
42. I am too fat.
43. I am too thin.
44. My glasses make my eyes hurt.
45. Sometimes I wet my bed.

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER PEOPLE

46. I need fore friends.
47. I can't make friends with very many kids.
48. I can't run as fast as the other kids.
49. I don't like people.
50. People don't like me very much.
51. People are too bossy.
52. People treat me like a little kid.
53. People make fun of me.
54. People won't answer my questions.
55. People don't think I'm ever right.
56. People won't help me.
57. I'm afraid of people.
58. People think I'm "spoiled."
59. People think I'm a sissy.
60. People think I'm too loud.
61. People think I'm too crabby.
62. I fight too much.
63. I always say the wrong thing at the wrong time.
64. The kids call me names.
65. The kids pick on me.
66. The kids chase me home.
67. The kids won't play with me.
68. The girls don't like to play with me.
69. The boys don't like to play with me.
70. I'd rather play with little kids.
71. The kids think I'm too smart.
72. The kids laugh at me.
73. I'm afraid to talk to people.
74. I'd like to have at least one good friend.
75. People don't like my friends.
76. I'd like to learn how to dance.
77. I wish people would leave me alone.
78. Nobody likes me.
79. People hurt my feelings.
80. I don't know how to act at a party.
81. I don't like the girls.
82. I don't like the boys.
83. I can't work with people.
84. I don't know how to talk to people.
85. I don't know why people get mad at me.

86. I'd like to know more about boys.
87. I'd like to know more about girls.
88. I'm not invited to parties.

ABOUT ME AND MY SCHOOL

89. I don't like school.
90. I don't like our schoolbooks.
91. I don't like arithmetic.
92. I don't like spelling.
93. I don't like reading.
94. I don't like writing.
95. I don't like history.
96. I don't like geography.
97. I don't like social studies.
98. I don't like gym.
99. I don't like music.
100. I don't like art.
101. I don't get good grades in school.
102. I don't see why I have to go to school.
103. I can't remember my schoolwork.
104. I'd like to find some good books to read.
105. I'd like to join a club in school.
106. I'd like to have a garden at school.
107. I'd like to paint more in school.
108. I'd like to have more music in school.
109. I'd like to do more things in school.
110. Our schoolroom gets too hot.
111. Our schoolroom gets too cold.
112. Our schoolroom is too dark.
113. Our schoolroom is too dirty.
114. I can't read very well.
115. I can't write very well.
116. I can't spell very well.
117. I can't do arithmetic very well.
118. I'm afraid of tests.

119. I always get in trouble in school.
120. I'm not smart enough.
121. I don't like teachers.
122. Teachers pick on me.
123. Teachers make fun of me.
124. Teachers won't answer my questions.
125. Teachers use words I don't know.
126. Teachers don't help me.
127. Teachers don't like me.
128. Teachers are too bossy.
129. I'm afraid of teachers.
130. I don't have any fun in school.
131. I'd like to quit school now.
132. My schoolwork is too easy.

ABOUT MYSELF

133. I am not nice looking.
134. I bite my fingernails too much.
135. I'm afraid someone will hit me.
136. I can't do anything right.
137. I feel bad about things I do.
138. I tell too many lies.
139. I feel mad most of the time.
140. I'm afraid my mother or daddy might die.
141. Sometimes I wish I was dead.
142. Sometimes I have to steal things.
143. I swear too much.
144. I get mad too much.
145. I do things I shouldn't do.
146. I want to be good and I can't.
147. I don't know what is wrong with me.
148. I don't have much fun.
149. I worry too much.
150. I'd like to be a boy.
151. I like to be a girl.
152. I can't talk very well.
153. I'd like more clothes.
154. I'd like a pet animal.
155. I'm afraid of animals.
156. I wish I could do more things by myself.
157. I'd like to get a job.
158. I wish I was good in games.
159. I'm afraid of loud noises.
160. I'm afraid of the doctor.
161. I'm afraid of the dentist.
162. I'm afraid of the dark.
163. I'm afraid to be home alone at night.
164. I'd like to know what I'm going to be when I grow up.
165. I am too nervous.
166. I am too short.
167. I am too tall.
168. I am too bashful.
169. I am too loud.
170. I am too careless.
171. I am too bossy.
172. I am too crabby.
173. I can't go to sleep at night.
174. I have bad dreams.
175. I talk too much.
176. I can't sit still.
177. I don't have enough money.

ABOUT ME AND MY HOME

178. I wish we had more money.
179. I'd like to have my own room.
180. I don't like to take music lessons.
181. I don't like to rest when the other kids are playing.
182. I wish I could take music lessons.
183. I wish I could go to more movies.
184. I don't have enough things to play with.
185. I wish we had a nice house.
186. I don't like my home.
187. I wish my daddy was home more.
188. I wish my mother would come back.
189. I'd like to have a brother or sister.
190. I don't like my clothes.
191. I wish I didn't have a brother.
192. I wish I didn't have a sister.
193. I wish my daddy would play with me more.
194. I wish my mother would play with me more.
195. My mother is too bossy.
196. My daddy is too bossy.
197. My brother is too bossy.
198. My sister is too bossy.
199. I don't like my brother.
200. I don't like my sister.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15925

201. I wish my mother liked me more.
202. I wish my daddy liked me more.
203. My mother and daddy often fight.
204. My mother treats me like a little kid.
205. My daddy treats me like a little kid.
206. My mother won't help me.
207. My daddy won't help me.
208. I don't like babies.
209. My mother makes fun of me.
210. My daddy makes fun of me.
211. My mother doesn't think I'm ever right.
212. My daddy doesn't think I'm ever right.
213. My mother won't answer my questions.
214. My daddy won't answer my questions.
215. I'm afraid of my mother.
216. I'm afraid of my daddy.
217. I'm afraid of my sister.
218. I'm afraid of my brother.
219. My home gets too hot.
220. My home gets too cold.
221. My home is too dark.
222. My home is too dirty.
223. I have to do too much work at home.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the persons who prepare the tests evidently do not think too highly of American education, to begin with, because they include in the test a list of words which they believe young people have difficulty with. Among the words thus listed are "bashful"—certainly a difficult word.

Other words included in the list are "bossy, breathe, crabby, dizzy, pep, pimples, sores, and stomach."

Those are the words which this organization thinks brilliant American children have trouble with, or have to be told the meaning of, before they will be able to take the tests.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall support the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

I do not expect to vote for the bill, because I believe it would remove education from the hands of the parents.

I should like to call attention to an article published in Human Events for June 16, 1958:

Archbishop O'Hara, in an address to the National Catholic Education Association, April 8, said: "I am afraid that sometimes some of our teachers overlook the fact that the philosophy of secularist counseling is based on the exclusion of God and the soul from the educational process. I mention this because counseling is the subject of a piece of legislation now before the Congress. A bill presented at this session proposes Federal subsidies for enlarged counseling service available to students in both public and nonpublic schools, its purpose being the discovery of latent talent that could profit by college education."

This publication also quotes the Reverend Robert G. Forbes, Congregational minister in Washington:

Proponents of H. R. 12630 are surely to be found in the company of those disciples of John Dewey and Sigmund Freud who managed to ban from public schools the reading of the Bible and the Ten Commandments.

Having spent many years as a military chaplain, I can say that I have dealt successfully with counseling situations only when I managed to relate the individual's problems to a belief in God and moral values.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Usually one says, "You took the words right out of my mouth," but the Senator from Nebraska took the slip right off my page, so I will destroy it.

I want to continue with a few quotations from other samplings of statements found in other publications.

This is from the Science Research Association Youth Inventory, as quoted in the Los Angeles Times of May 26, 1958:

80. I have thought of suicide.
89. People dislike my race or nationality.
93. I have a crush on an older person.
155. I am not attractive to the other sex.
173. I don't feel I belong in the family.
187. I wish my father had a higher-level job.
188. I'm sometimes ashamed of my family.
203. I wonder if I am normal in my sex development.
212. Should I be bothered by dirty stories and vulgar talk?
213. My family avoids discussing sex with me.
277. How far should high-school students go in love relations?
230. I have conflicting information about sexual matters.
231. I want to know about venereal disease.
236. What can I do about body odor?
238. I smoke too much.
240. I have trouble with my menstrual period.
258. I want to get rid of pimples.
285. I am losing faith in religion.
293. Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?
291. Does it really pay to be honest?

The "Mooney Problem Check," as quoted by the same newspaper, contains the following statements and questions, and again I shall not read them all:

- No one to tell my troubles to.
- Wanted to know more about boys.
- Swearing and dirty stories.
- Family quarrels.
- Wanting to know more about girls.
- Wanting to run away from home.
- Wanting to know more about marriage.
- Should I neck, to be popular?
- Should high-school student pet and make love?
- Want things my parents can't give me.
- Wanting to improve my figure.
- My parents are too strict.
- I am sometimes ashamed of my family.
- I feel there is a barrier between myself and parents.
- My allowance is too small.
- My parents don't respect my opinions.

Mr. President, I have read many questions and statements, but I have not read anything which might influence me, if I were a commissioner of education, to pick out one student over another student and say that he was deserving of money from the Federal Government for the purpose of a scholarship. In fact, I would go to the houses of the children and talk to the parents, because with them may lie the fault not the State or the Federal Government as yet.

It is hardly surprising that many parents—when they do find out about these tests—complain that they tend to undermine belief in God, respect for parents and even the self-respect of the individual child.

It is more surprising, but certainly highly significant, that the test makers themselves are at loggerheads as to the validity of one another's tests. Even Mr.

John R. Ludington of the Office of Education concedes:

There are, to be sure, instances when individual measures on a single test might not be reliable. . . . The advantage, I think, is in having a series of tests or a battery of tests rather than reliance upon a single test.¹

However, Prof. Donald E. Super, of Teachers College, Columbia University, in a study of Multifactor Tests in Guidance, published in Personnel Guidance Journal, points out:

A dim view of multifactor test batteries is taken by Cronbach in the 1956 issues of Annual Review of Psychology. Cronbach goes on to cite the withdrawal of the American Council on Education Psychological Examination from the market, and its replacement by a measure of verbal and quantitative achievement (the Cooperative School and College Ability Test), as further evidence of the dubious status of differential aptitude testing.

After reviewing a number of papers by prominent test makers, Dr. Super gives his unqualified approval to only one battery of tests as valid for use in the high schools at this time.

There is nothing in this bill to assure that only this one battery may be used—assuming Professor Super to be correct in his appraisal. Hundreds and hundreds of different tests are currently in use, all recommended by their respective makers and all under intellectual attack by some other expert.

I can recall this particular instance very well. It is quoted in Sorokin's Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences. I am sure some of my colleagues from the Far West remember back to the time when Professor Terman sifted a school population of a quarter million in order to identify and study a thousand or more with the highest I. Q. In 1935, 25 years later, he tested the group he had selected, 1,070 schoolchildren. Here is what he found. This is interesting. I call the attention of my colleagues to it, because it points up one of the broad steps to the stupidity we are achieving tonight in trying to say the Federal Government can take over not only the functions of the schools, but also the functions of the families:

Twenty-five years later, at the mean age of 35, the 1,070 schoolchildren, selected by a battery of the best intelligence tests available, and certified by the tests as being the most gifted among some 250,000 schoolchildren in California, have not demonstrated any notable superiority over a typical sampling of children of the professional, semiprofessional, and business classes from which 81.4 percent of them came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I think that is condemnation enough of the idea that the Federal Government should now begin to finance these tests which, year after year, professor after professor, college after college, have passed on as being inconclusive.

¹ House hearings, part II, p. 773.

If the Senators doubt the extent to which this \$150 million is going to be subjected to Federal scrutiny, let him read what has to be complied with when the State draws up these measures.

If the Federal Government is going to say to the families of America that we now have to guide and counsel the children of America as to what is the best courses for them to take in college and what should be their best pursuit in life, I think we have really tossed in the sponge.

I do not want the Federal Government counseling my children. I do not want my own State counseling my children. That is the job of American parents and American churches. Have we gone so far down the ladder on rubbery legs that we are frightened to death by Russia and must say to the parents of the country, "Do not bother with your children. We are going to take them over. We will tell them what to study and what we want them to do, and how to do it. You keep on drinking your beer and watching television"? If so, this country is going to pot in a Cadillac, and not in a chariot, as happened in the days of Rome.

It seems to me, Mr. President, until the testing experts can get together on what tests are valid and what are not, we would be unwise to vote Federal funds to further psychological experimentation with the minds of the Nation's youths. I therefore offer my amendment to strike title VII from the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think my distinguished and beloved friend from Arizona has completely missed the purpose of this title. It was put in the bill because of the President's recommendation and his desire to identify aptitudes. Title VII reads, "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students."

Let me read what the President stated in his message transmitting his recommendations relative to our educational system on January 27, 1958:

High-quality professional personnel in science, engineering, teaching, languages, and other critical fields are necessary to our national security effort. Each year, nevertheless, many young people drop out of high school before graduation. Many able high-school graduates do not go on to college. This represents a waste of needed talent. Much of this waste could be avoided if the aptitudes of these young people were identified and they were encouraged toward the fullest development of their abilities.

The administration proposes, therefore, that the Congress authorize—

(a) Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

(b) Matching grants to the States to encourage the strengthening of local counseling and guidance services, so that more able students will be encouraged to stay in high

school, to put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education. The program also would provide for grants of funds to colleges and universities to permit them to establish training institutes to improve the qualifications of counseling and guidance personnel.

I simply cannot understand the distinguished Senator's argument or the questions he raises, which seem to have nothing to do with the matter at all. What we are trying to do is to identify the able students. That is the recommendation of the President. One of the purposes of the bill I introduced was to endeavor to accomplish the President's recommendations, as contained in title VII. It is for us to decide whether the President was correct. We must realize the need to seek the best talent in the country.

I have been in the education field. The greatest pleasure I had in education was to talk to the young men and women who wanted advice from older people as to the best course to follow to become this or that. Why should we not have people to advise these young men and women? I think it would be intelligent and cooperative to do so, and it is a reasonable function in the education process.

That is all I have to say. It seems to me we have to choose what is in the bill and in the President's recommendation. That seems to me to be a logical course if we are really going to step up our educational process. The best qualified young men and women should be obtained from the high schools, for training in science, if they are able, willing, and eager to take on a profession which will lead to progress in our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, so far as testing is concerned, that the testing is entirely in the hands of the State educational agency?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So far as I know that is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. The testing is entirely in the hands of the State educational agency.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HILL. So far as any guidance or counseling of the individual student is concerned, with respect to the courses the student might best take to improve himself in school, that is a matter which is left entirely in the hands of the State and local people, the teachers and counselors in the school. The Federal Government will have nothing to say about who does the job or who is employed. There is nothing whatever provided so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

There is to be a small grant of funds, to be matched by the States, to be used for these purposes, but the program will be entirely in the hands of State and local school officials; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. This is something which has been done in regard to schools for many years. Federal funds have been used for such purpose for 40 years, at least, under the vocational education program. There is no difference between what is proposed now and what has been done for 40 years with Federal funds under the vocational education program. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government has nothing whatever to say about who is selected for guidance or counseling, what those persons shall do, or how they shall guide or counsel. That is a matter which is entirely in the hands of the State and local school authorities. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In confirmation of that statement, I shall read again what I read previously from the President's message:

Matching grants to the States to encourage improved State and local testing programs to identify the potential abilities of students at an early stage in their education.

The language is very clear.

Mr. HILL. The provision is on all fours and carries out the recommendation of President Eisenhower. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is what I am trying to emphasize. The President requested that we set up the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I admire my remarkable friend from Arizona very much, but as to the amendment now under consideration I must take a position opposed to him. I have given thought and study to this particular phase of the bill, and even today I have discussed it with the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I know something about conditions in my own State. I will say to the Senator from Arizona and to my other colleagues there are many families which are in no position whatever to give the children we are trying to aid by this proposed legislation the counseling and guidance the children need. Many families in my State are first-generation immigrants. The parents in the families sometimes cannot even speak English. The children go to school, and I will say that those children are some of the finest citizens in our State.

The evidence proves the program would be very useful in trying to obtain,

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15927

from the high schools in particular, some of the boys and girls with real capabilities who are not able to use their capabilities because they do not know enough of the process. There are families with children who have divorced parents, or parents who are alcoholics, or one thing and another.

Mr. President, I believe this is a worthy program. When the counseling has been done well it has been very valuable. I hope the Senator's amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished friend from New Jersey and with my very good friend from Connecticut that guidance coming from teachers is a very desirable and, I repeat, a very natural thing. It is a custom which has been followed by the teachers in our schools, I imagine, ever since the first school was established in this country. I approve of that kind of guidance.

What I do not approve of and what we ought to be wary of is the type of guidance which will come from a professional guidance group set up under the law.

It is all well and good for my friends to say that the States will control the matter, and to hark back to the Vocational Education Act. I will say to my colleagues again that this is one of my fears. The language of section 703 reads:

Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1204.

Once again it will be necessary to come to Washington and present to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the requirements of the State of Arizona, the requirements of the State of New Jersey, and the requirements of the State of Connecticut, before anything can be paid for the guidance program, which should be the natural function of the family and the teacher.

If my colleagues will be so kind as to read section 1204, they will find that section is about 2 pages long and contains a statement of quite a few things which a State must do before payment can be made.

Section 703 provides that these plans can set forth:

A program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability.

I shall read from page 759 of the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with regard to limitations on test procedures, from a statement by Roger W. Russell, executive sec-

retary, American Psychological Association, who was accompanied by Lee J. Cronbach, professor of the University of Illinois. Mr. Russell said:

There is no strong evidence that tests measure potential creativity or inventiveness.

Mr. President, we have had no testimony that such tests are needed. We fall back on the old cliché that the administration wants this program. Perhaps I am a little old-fashioned, but I go back to the idea that we have three separate branches of government. It is our duty to legislate, not to be told by someone at the other end of the avenue or someone in some building halfway down the avenue what we are supposed to do. I do not put much credence in the statement that the administration wants any State in this Union to have any guidance, counseling, and testing program. I think that is a matter for this body to decide.

The second part of section 703 calls for a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State—

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. GOLDWATER. May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. The statement was made a few minutes ago, I believe by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that this matter would be left in the hands of the local authorities. The Senator read from the bottom of page 39 of the bill these words:

The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

Subsection (a) reads as follows:

Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1204 (a)—

And so forth. That means that the Commissioner in Washington must approve the plan. It must be a plan which is directed through the State agency, and not through the local communities. Regardless of how Senators feel as to whether testing is advisable or not, the question here is simply whether we want Washington to be required to approve the counseling, or whether we want to do it back in the States. There is \$15 million that can be given to the States for this purpose, if they consent to let Washington approve these plans. There is no question about the provision. Washington must approve the plans, and I think the Senate ought to be clear on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has once more expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself 1 more minute.

I am serious about this amendment. I am very hopeful that the chairman may accept it, inasmuch as there was

practically no evidence showing the need for this service, and the absence of this provision from the bill would make it more palatable to those of us who do not like the idea of Federal aid to education, because my amendment would remove, for this year, one of the direct controls over State participation in the program. To me, if it is not removed, it will serve as a guidepost as to what we can expect in the coming Congresses. If the temper of this Congress prevails in the next one and others to follow, we shall have more and more Federal aid to education, to the point where the local school boards, the local superintendents, and even the State superintendents will have nothing to say about the education of our children.

I urge the Senate to act favorably on my amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "8-11-58-F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, beginning after "guidance," in line 5, it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such personnel and teachers while attending such institutes."

On page 31, beginning after "schools," in line 22 it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 2 on page 32, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such individuals while attending such institutes."

On page 32, beginning after "school," in line 17 it is proposed to strike out all to the period in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof "and for loans in accordance with part E to be made by the Commissioner to such individuals while attending such institutes."

On page 33, between lines 6 and 7 it is proposed to insert the following:

PART E—LOANS

Authorization

SEC. 541. (a) Any person who attends an institute established under the provisions of this title shall be entitled to a loan, made in accordance with subsection (b), in the amount of \$75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute in good standing, as determined by the Commissioner.

(b) Loans made under the provisions of this section—

(1) shall be made without security, except that the borrower shall execute a promissory note payable to the United States;

(2) shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in ac-

cordance with regulations of the Commissioner:

(3) may be made in such installments as the Commissioner deems appropriate;

(4) shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum on the unpaid principal balance thereof, except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which the repayment of the loan is to begin;

(5) shall be repaid, together with interest thereon, in graduated periodic installments, in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner, over a period beginning 1 year after the date on which the borrower ceases to attend such institute and ending not later than 11 years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on a loan made under this section, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, (ii) not in excess of 3 years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (iii) during which the borrower is serving in a full-time position as a teacher in an elementary or secondary school in any State, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the 10-year period during which the repayment must be completed, and (C) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan; and

(6) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 33 1/3 percent of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service.

On page 3, it is proposed to amend the table of contents by inserting after "Sec. 531. Determination of eligibility," the following:

PART E—LOANS

SEC. 541. Authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Kentucky plans to speak for only a very short time. Then it is hoped that a vote may be had on his amendment. So far as I am aware, the Senate can then vote on the bill. If there are any further amendments, they will go over until tomorrow. If not, a vote will be had on the bill as soon as action is concluded on the pending amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this is the last amendment I shall offer. I shall not ask for a ye and nay vote. I shall ask for a division.

My amendment is directed to title V of the bill. This title establishes 3 institutes, 1 for counseling and guidance training, one for foreign languages, and a third called General Institutes. These institutes would be established in institutions of higher learning by the Commissioner of Education. Their purpose is to train teachers, either in counseling and guidance, in foreign languages, or, in the General Institutes, for general purposes.

Tuition at these institutes would be paid by the Federal Government, and I believe this fair. The committee bill provides also that grants shall be paid to the teachers who attend the institutes, and, in addition, it provides allow-

ances for dependent children when they attend the institutes.

The House bill has a similar title, except that no General Institute is established in the House bill. The House provides that stipends of \$75 weekly shall be paid to teachers attending the institutes, and that allowances for dependent children shall be \$15 a week.

I understand that the usual institute is from 8 to 12 weeks, if we assume 12 weeks, and the stipend would be \$75 a week, \$900 would be paid to a teacher for attending the institute. If there should be a dependent child or two, the allowance would be \$15 or \$30 more per week.

I know that it is difficult for teachers to pay their expenses to attend these institutes. My amendment would not require them to pay their expenses. But I point out the purpose of the institutes is that teachers receiving training in the institute shall return to their schools to teach. I assume that they will return to teach and I believe most of them will.

My amendment proposes to make advances to teachers, in the amount of \$75 a week, with no allowances for dependent children. The allowance would amount to \$900, but it would be a loan, under the easy provisions of the bill. It could be a 12-year loan, but the teacher would not be required to repay the loan if he continued to teach. For my amendment provides that if the teacher attending the institute continues to teach, the loan, whatever its total may be, shall be forgiven at the rate of 33 1/3 percent a year. If the teacher continued to teach for 3 years, the loan would be repaid. Of course, if he should get a better job and leave the teaching profession, it seems to me that he should repay the loan over a period of 12 years, for the purpose of the institute is to train teachers for continued teaching. My amendment is fair to teachers selected for the institutes, for they would not be out of pocket for their expenses and could repay in money, or 33 1/3 percent of the loan would be forgiven for each year of teaching. It is fairer to other teachers who would not get Federal help and who must take advance training, and are forced to pay all their expenses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that the Senator's amendment could serve a useful purpose, if I correctly understand it. As I understand, it would not change the availability of funds to aid teachers to take these special courses.

Mr. COOPER. Not at all. Every teacher admitted would receive full expense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it does provide that, instead of being an outright gift, the allowance shall be in the form of a loan, which will be forgiven at the rate of one-third for each year the teacher may continue to teach the courses afterward.

Mr. COOPER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that is on all fours with the principle we followed during the war, when we provided for the medical education of certain students, and required that they should serve at least 1 year—or whatever the requirement was—in the Medical Corps of one of the military branches. That insured that in return for the medical education and for deferment from other military service, the Government would get some service in the Medical Corps.

In this instance the Senator is attempting to make certain that where money is advanced to teachers for obtaining special courses that they will actually spend some time in teaching those courses afterwards, or else repay the money.

Mr. COOPER. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment has been very much clarified by the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. To sum it up, the Senator's amendment replaces the stipends or gifts with loans. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the sum and substance of it. The Cooper amendment would provide loans which could be repaid or earned back, so to speak, if the people performed their teaching services.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I were to describe the amendment, I would call it the birth control amendment. The elimination of the provision for dependent children is quite unrealistic and fails to take into account a practical problem which confronts us in regard to the small institutes. We have a good many teachers in secondary schools who have large families. They are recognized as teachers who have great teaching potentialities, and who ought to be encouraged to take further training.

What do they have to do? They are already paid such low salaries that the fathers of large families in the teaching profession have to engage in some other work during the summer.

I am not talking about exceptional cases. The cases exist by the hundreds. It is recognized that if we are to give these particular individuals the advantages they need and make it possible for them to get better positions in the teaching professions, so they can make greater contributions, it is necessary to send them to institutes.

What do they say? They say, "We cannot afford to do it, because we do not have the funds to take care of our children." The unmarried teachers or the young married teachers with very small families can go, but the amendment makes it impossible for the teachers with the big families to go to the institute. We must face up to the reality of the teachers' families. A very competent teacher ought to be encour-

aged to go to an institute. It is only common sense that we ought to make an arrangement for the payment of an additional stipend to help take care of a larger family, so that the father of the family may take the institute training.

I happen to be against birth control, particularly in this kind of situation. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In committee we discussed the subject of the stipends. It seemed that that was the least we could do for the teachers who are willing to undergo the training.

The amendment would effect a complete departure from the policies and regulations previously established by Congress for the conduct of training institutes by the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Health, as well as the training programs conducted by other government agencies, such as the professional nurse traineeship program, the public health traineeship program, and the vocational rehabilitation program.

The Teachers Institutes in title V of S. 4237 will be modeled on these programs. They will be administered by the institutions of higher education, under the supervision of the Commissioner of Education. I think we can assume that the Commissioner will approve only those institutes which conform to the pattern already established by Congress, and which are approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Therefore I cannot support the Cooper amendment. I urge that the Senate retain the present language of the Institute title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if we adopt the amendment we discriminate against the teachers of our country, the poorest paid, most underpaid, the most miserably paid group in America.

Under the Public Health Service, under the training program for professional nurses, under the program of the National Science Foundation, under the programs of vocational rehabilitation, and under all other Government programs we provide stipends. The amendment would pick out the teachers and deny the stipends to the teachers when they take a short 4-week course in the summertime. If we required them to pay back these stipends, it would cost the Government more in red tape and in administration and in the collection of these loans than it would cost by giving them the same benefits we give to the other people under the various Government programs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4237) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that, under the order previously entered, the bill having been read the third time, the Senate now proceeds to the consideration of H. R. 13247, the companion House bill, to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs, to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes; that the House bill is deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 4237, as amended; and that the amendment is deemed to be engrossed and the bill, as amended, read the third time.

The bill (H. R. 13247), as amended, is now before the Senate, and the question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Less than a year ago, the Russian sputnik shocked us out of our complacency. I sincerely hope the scientific successes and development of our own country since that date have not lulled us to sleep. By enacting into law S. 4237, we will assure ourselves that we will be graduating in the future the scientists, engineers, technicians, and mathematicians so important to us in this highly technical world in which we live today. These will be the men and women who will help forge the progress and leadership our Nation must possess if we are to regain a position of unquestioned world leadership.

I am happy to rise in support of this National Defense Education Act of 1958. When Congress reconvened last January, I introduced several education bills of my own, namely: S. 2916, S. 2917, and S. 3281. I had hoped that we could act swiftly on these education measures so that they could become effective in the school year beginning next month. I was convinced that we could regain unquestioned world leadership in science and technology only through our educators and our system of education. That is why I felt it was so essential that Congress act early in the session. I regret that this was not done.

I am pleased, however, that we have the opportunity to enact effective education legislation now, before we adjourn. I am particularly pleased that S. 4237 includes most of what I had proposed in the bills I introduced last January. My bills included a national scholarship program and provision for loans to colleges and universities for

science equipment and facilities. Both of these items are included in the Hill bill.

There are many other worthwhile features in the National Defense Education Act which I will not enumerate, but I do want to go on record in support of this bill as a "giant step" in the right direction.

I regret the action of the House of Representatives in eliminating the scholarship provisions of their version of the bill. I strongly feel that we must include a scholarship program if we are going to encourage the most apt of our students to continue their education beyond the high school level. A loan program will not provide sufficient motivation to bring into our colleges and universities the number of future scientists, engineers, and technicians our country needs. Therefore, I want to go on record as favoring the provision in the bill now before us which calls for 23,000 4-year scholarships.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams and a letter I received on the pending subject.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, NEV., August 11, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request you oppose Federal scholarship bills now before Senate. Expenditure not justified; too much Federal interference in schools as is. Federal money would undoubtedly put controls on curriculum of both the recipient and the college of their choice. Regards.

THOMAS A. SMITH,
Member, Nevada State Council on
Education.

BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NEV., August 9, 1958.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly oppose any action on Federal scholarship.

E. DIGRAZIA,
Member, State Council on Education.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., August 11, 1958.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please vote in opposition to any further Federal aid to education and to Federal scholarship.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. DEWEY SOLOMON,
Mrs. WENDELL BUNKER.

RENO, NEV., August 8, 1958.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your opposition to Federal scholarship bills.

S. VERNON WINES.

BOULDER CITY, NEV., August 8, 1958.
Senator MOLLY MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote to oppose Federal scholarship bill.

LILLIAN COLLINS.

15930

ELKO, NEV., August 8, 1958.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We repeat our resolution being directly opposed to Federal aid to education, particularly pending bills on Federal aid to scholarships.

R. H. PEARCE,
President, Elko Chamber of Commerce.

JIGGS, NEV., August 7, 1958.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please oppose the Federal scholarship bill which will be in the Senate for debate next week, I understand.

We oppose Federal aid to our schools—our last stand against socialism.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

FERN J. BARNES,

Member, Citizens Committee on Education

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill because I believe it will—

First. Bring about the destruction of the privately financed scholarship foundations.

Second. Drive the students of highest ability from the hundreds of small colleges of the Nation to a few colleges of high prestige.

Third. Enlarge the power and the size of an already oversized Federal Government incapable, because of its bigness, to efficiently manage its affairs and finances.

Fourth. Lead to the control of our educational system by the Federal Government, with its dangerous potentialities of exercising centralized influence and of limiting academic freedom.

Fifth. Weaken private, municipal and State initiative in educational affairs.

Sixth. Emphasize the fallacious belief that Federal moneys are the cure for all evils.

Seventh. Fail to recognize the frightening fiscal predicament of the Federal Government at a time when State and local governments are financially in a far better position to finance the scholarships if they are necessary. There is not a State in the Nation which is not in a better financial position than the Federal Government to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield to no one in the confidence I have in the youth of our country. I think they are much smarter than we realize. We have been talking about giving them something: grants, gifts, stipends, loans. Yet the Government of the United States cannot manage its affairs so as to pay the current costs of government.

A deficit of \$10 billion or \$12 billion will accrue this year. Whose debt will it be? It will be the debt of the youth of the land.

Tonight we try to "kid" them and say, "We will increase the debt a little and give you something." But we cannot even pay the current costs of government. With more people employed in the United States than ever before in its history, with all the years of prosperity which our country has enjoyed, the Government is unable to manage its affairs without adding to the debt.

The greatest thing we can do for the youth of America is to pass on to them our American heritage; to make secure for them our economic system; to assure the solvency of the Federal Government.

For many years people have raised their voices about the Federal debt. But I submit that if the deficit of the current year continues to increase at this rate for 10 years, we will reach the point of no return.

Congress has instigated program after program to add to the debt and place it on the shoulders of the youth of the Nation. Tonight we insult their intelligence by telling them we are going to give them something. We send word to the people back home: "Do not reappraise your schools. Do not have town meetings to see what you can do to improve your educational facilities. Uncle Sam will do it for you."

We shall be directing a blow at the best kind of education if we pass the bill. Make no mistake about it; this is not a bill for Federal aid to education; it is a bill for Federal education.

Many persons were shocked when the Army marched into Little Rock to run the schools. If we pass the bill, before many years there will be an army of psychologists, counselors, guidance experts, inspectors, bureaucrats, and others who will approve or disapprove the local plans and will direct and select the teachers who are to institute the programs. What teachers will they be? They will be those who will go along.

Mr. President, this is Federal education. It is beginning tonight. The cost enumerated here is small compared with what it will be. There is nothing in the bill which changes the courses of study. There is nothing which provides that the money shall be used to redirect teaching efforts.

This is a bill to take education away from the parents and the localities, and to place it in bureaucratic Washington.

I hope the bill will be defeated. If it is not, the President of the United States ought to defeat it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Hear! Hear!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who said this is a day of decision in American history, because we are deciding, at midnight, whether we will let the educational system of the United States drift away or whether the power of the Federal Government will be put into the scale on the

side of a better educational system for the American people.

Mr. President, these are times which challenge America's military, intellectual, spiritual, and material leadership. This is our day of decision. What we do here today can represent a beginning in this Nation's answer to the Communist challenge in education and to our own increased educational needs. America must educate more young people in the highly complex skills which the Nation needs to sustain and to continue to progress in the free world.

Our answer to the Nation's educational needs is based, in part, upon information and advice which resulted from the valuable and constructive hearings held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The committee discussed these needs with outstanding scientists, leaders, educators, and representatives of professional organizations. We have weighed the evidence, we have measured the facts, and I, for one, am thoroughly convinced that they call for action on the part of this Congress.

There can be no question—time does not permit further delay in remedying the fact that—

First. Excellence in scholastic achievement continues to go largely unrewarded. Each year almost one-half of the Nation's most talented and capable students do not continue their education beyond the high school. This results in a serious loss of the optimum development of brainpower so vitally needed in the industrial and defense efforts of our time.

Second. Thousands of capable students who would pursue higher education in preparation for careers in teaching or science are discouraged by the cost of 4 years of college, which has more than doubled since 1940.

Countless thousands of other students of good potential do not pursue post-high-school studies because of a lack of motivation in the home, in the school, and in the larger community.

Third. At a time when the technically and scientifically trained person is most needed, about 100,000 seniors attend public high schools where no advanced mathematics of any kind is offered. Only 1 out of 3 students takes a chemistry course; 1 out of 4, physics; 1 out of 3, intermediate algebra; and 1 out of 8, trigonometry or solid geometry.

Fourth. The foreign language picture is equally dim. Of all public high schools in the United States, 56.4 percent offer no modern foreign language instruction to their students, not quite half of the public high schools in 25 States teach modern foreign languages.

Fifth. There are still 91,500 full-time teachers in our public schools who hold less than standard certificates. This situation is further complicated by the failure of most of the States to develop modern foreign language, mathematics, and science courses of study and teachers guides.

Schools have been slow in adopting newer methods which would enhance the teaching-learning situation such as the mass mediums of television, radio, films, and other audio-visual aids.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15931

Sixth. The quality of instruction in higher education in no small measure will determine the excellence of our future professional men and women. We must prevent further deterioration in the qualifications of teachers in our institutions of higher education. This gradual breakdown is reflected by the fact that in 1953-54, 31 percent of new college teachers had doctoral degrees. Three years later this figure had dropped to only 23 percent, which indicates a serious deterioration in the qualifications of new college teachers.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama, stated upon the occasion of the opening of the recent hearings on science and education for national defense:

We Americans know we must mobilize our Nation's brainpower in the struggle for survival.

In the interest of national defense the Federal Government must undertake a definite role in the solution of certain educational problems. I think Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University summarized this point quite adequately when he stated:

In the interest of not only national defense, but also the maintenance of our system of Government and the free-enterprise system itself . . . the Federal Government must do everything in its power to improve and strengthen our American educational system by stimulating, motivating, and supporting both private and local governmental efforts to improve the effectiveness of American education.

The testimony heard by the Senate committee, the reports, and studies of various groups concerned with education, all substantiate one prevailing fact: The greatest need in American education today is a new emphasis on the pursuit of learning, and a new esteem for academic teaching and academic accomplishment. We have already said that the fullest utilization of our brainpower resources must be accomplished if we would advance scientific research, man our commerce and industry, staff our schools and fill our public offices with qualified people.

The National Defense Education Act has been carefully and thoughtfully designed to offer assistance to the States to help them improve and expand the quality of their educational programs where it is most needed.

In summarizing the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, the committee reports that—

Scholarship awards are offered to stimulate and challenge high school students to do their best, and to stimulate parents to insist not only that their children work hard, but that their schools provide the proper courses of instruction. Additional scholarship grants based on need will also aid scholarship winners to complete a 4-year college education. Student loans will be available to other highly qualified college students needing financial assistance.

A limited number of fellowship grants are offered those who advance into graduate school to obtain their doctoral degrees and thus better qualify themselves to be college instructors.

Secondary—and elementary-school teachers will have the opportunity to attend spe-

cial institutes where they may increase their knowledge of the subjects they teach. Able students will be encouraged to become teachers by a forgiveness feature in the student loan program under which recipients who later enter the teaching profession will have their loans canceled in 5 years at the rate of 20 percent for each year they teach.

The bill provides for aptitude testing of children as they are entering high school, in order to identify the particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually, can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college.

Provision is made for research and experimentation in the use of television and other modern media of communication for educational purposes.

To enable students to secure the most benefit from courses in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, grants will be made to State educational agencies, on a matching basis, for purchase of modern laboratory equipment.

To help meet the defense and foreign relations needs of the Nation, language and area centers will be provided to give instruction in the language and culture of foreign peoples, especially those in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Soviet Union.

To help assure an adequate supply of technical personnel to assist scientists and engineers, area vocational educational schools will be created to give instruction in techniques and skills essential to the national defense.

To assure that scientists and researchers shall have available to them the latest developments in their fields, there is established a science information service for indexing, abstracting, translating, and distributing to American scientists the findings of scientific research throughout the world.

By enacting the bill, we will say to the American people, that this Nation will recognize and reward scholastic achievement through a well-constructed program of scholarships. We say also, that we must improve guidance, counseling, and testing in order that we can identify capable students and help students attain the heights of their potential. We would further recognize the Nation's urgent need to have more well-taught science, mathematics and modern foreign language courses.

One of the most valuable features of the national defense education proposal is that it reflects awareness of the dependency of one phase of learning upon another. For example, the bill would help to meet some of our more specific needs for the scientific and professionally trained person. At the same time it recognizes the continuing value of existing programs such as vocational education and its role in the training of technicians. The better reporting of statistics on education and the need for better scientific information receive due and proper attention under the provisions of this act. The design of this legislation will not allow us to rob Peter to pay Paul.

The fulfillment of America's educational needs presents our citizens with one of the most demanding, most imper-

ative and most momentous tasks of these times. The strategic importance of good education has both national and international implications: First, the forward progress of our own society both in terms of productive living and responsible citizenship depends upon a more highly trained, more informed, enlightened and learned citizenry, because the effects of education are felt in every phase of society, the task of overcoming long-existing deficiencies, of enriching present programs, and of improving and expanding each of our State school systems is truly momentous; and, second, America as a democratic society and as one of the leaders of the world's free peoples must be able to respond to the scientific, technical and educational challenges of another nation which seeks only to further the cause of totalitarianism.

To me, one of the most expeditious and feasible means by which this challenge can be met, and the problems of American education soundly solved is through a system of Federal assistance to the States for those programs which are in most dire need of attention. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 would provide that Federal assistance. I consider this proposal to be a sound and purposeful measure through which the Federal Government may make a responsible and significant contribution to the solution of our educational problems. My membership on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and participation in the hearings concerning science and education for national defense have served to strengthen my conviction that the enactment of S. 4327 is a must.

Mr. President, I commend the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the senior Senator from Alabama, for his unflinching courtesy and the great patience and care with which the hearings were conducted. They reflect credit upon him, on the committee, and on the Government of the United States. Likewise, I pay my sincere tribute to the educators who testified before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are about to act on one of the most important measures of this or any other session.

The Nation can be no stronger than its people. Modern machines have performed miracles. But they cannot, no matter how complicated, replace the human mind.

It would be difficult to imagine a more complicated field of legislation than this. There is no doubt of our need to strengthen the educational system of our country. But at the same time, we do not want to encase our system in a totalitarian mold.

Americans value deeply the traditional system under which the control of education will be in the hands of the local people who are affected. They rightly do not want to abandon that system.

We were looking for a way through which help could be extended without the control of Federal bureaucracy. And in this bill I believe we have found it.

15932

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 13

Our Nation is very fortunate that standing at the helm of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee was the very able, very experienced, senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I know of no more effective legislator in the Senate—no man who does a better job in representing his State and serving his country.

The committee approaches the problems with prudence, with caution, and with a desire to produce an effective, workable bill. Fortunately, the committee consists of men extremely well-qualified to handle the problem.

The thanks of the Senate and the thanks of the Nation are due the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and my own colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Equal thanks are due the members of the minority who were led by the scholarly senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I think that since he is retiring from the Senate this is a fitting measure to serve as a climax to his distinguished legislative career.

The same can be said of our dedicated senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives].

Of course, there were Members who opposed this bill. But again, they debated the issues and kept consideration of the measure on a plane befitting its importance.

This generation will be remembered as the one which permitted the education of our children to slip behind the present-day level of human knowledge. Let us hope that it will not also be remembered for failure to remedy this deplorable situation once we became aware of it.

It took the Soviet satellites and the Soviet ballistic missiles to arouse us to the full dimensions of our peril. We have taken many steps since Sputnik I, seeking to close the gap.

We have appropriated billions of dollars for missiles, planes, and scientific research. We have reorganized the Defense Department. We have established a Space Agency. We have increased material incentives to keep our skilled and able men in the armed services.

This represents a tremendous investment of the resources and the energy of the American people.

I would remind my colleagues of another tremendous investment in the resources and the energies of the people of a proud Nation. It was the Maginot Line behind which France thought it could sit in safety.

Tons of concrete were poured into the Maginot Line. The ablest artillery experts of the time carefully implaced guns of every description to cover every conceivable spot in front of the line.

Elaborate systems of underground transportation were laid out. There were elevators and cars and devices to insure the indefinite preservation of the French soldiers who manned the line.

But despite the concrete and the guns and the elaborate fortifications, the Maginot Line did not slow up the advance of the German armies for a day once they began to move. The Maginot Line represented one of the most wasteful investments in all of history simply because it had a fatal weakness—it could be outflanked.

The billions of dollars that we have spent on missiles, planes, guns, ships, radar, and the other implements of modern war could easily become another Maginot Line. The instruments are worthless if we do not have educated minds to control them.

There is no security except in people. The Atlas, the Thor, and the Jupiter will be obsolete within a few years. And once they are obsolete there will be nothing left of our investment in them except the experience we have gained.

But there is one investment in which the United States can never lose. It is the investment in the minds of our young people. I wish to say to my colleagues that it would be a mistake to consider this measure solely from the standpoint of national defense. I believe a major issue before our country is that of security, but we would live within narrow and limited horizons if we thought that security was a matter of weapons alone.

Security consists of people who are alert, people who are vigilant, and people who are trained to cope with the tremendous problems of the modern world.

We cannot cope with those problems unless we have men skilled in physics, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, and all of the natural sciences, but neither can we cope with them if our training is solely in the natural sciences.

We look for citizens who are broad-gauged, who understand the workings of our system, who are conscious of the great heritage of our culture. We need men and women who understand Aristotle as well as Darwin; who are as familiar with Shakespeare as they are with Einstein and Newton. The time may come when we will have to take up arms once again to defend our heritage. But we must know what it is that we are defending, and even more important we must know the kind of world which we wish to extend and create so that our descendants can live in peace and progress.

Mr. President, this measure is an important step in that direction. It is only the first step but, as such, it is an historic landmark and the Nation owes a debt of eternal gratitude to those who contributed to its achievement.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Church in the chair). All time has been yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Hobbitz	Morton
Barrett	Humphrey	Mundt
Beall	Ives	Neuberger
Bush	Jackson	Eastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Revercomb
Church	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Symington
Ervin	Magnuson	Thye
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Green	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—26

Bennett	Eastland	Robertson
Bible	Frear	Russell
Bricker	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Butler	Hruska	Talmadge
Byrd	Jenner	Thurmond
Capehart	Lausche	Watkins
Curtis	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—8

Chavez	Holland	O'Mahoney
Dirksen	Javits	Payne
Flanders	Murray	

So the bill H. R. 13247 was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the funeral services of Representative McVey. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent, because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference, in London, as chairman of the Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Church in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.